

THE TITLE ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ
IN EARLY BYZANTINE
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

EVANGELOS K. CHRYSOS

This paper was prepared at the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies during my stay there in the fall of 1976. I would like to thank the faculty, research and library staffs, and the visiting fellows for their help and advice, especially Prof. Philip Grierson, who kindly discussed the numismatic material. I would also like to thank Nancy Rogers Bowen for editing this study for publication.

INTRODUCTION

In the *intitulatio* of a Novel promulgated by Heraclius and his son Heraclius New Constantine on March 21, 629, L. Bréhier discovered in 1905 the first instance for the assumption of the title βασιλεύς in protocols of official imperial documents: Ἡράκλειος καὶ Ἡράκλειος νέος Κωνσταντίνος πιστοὶ ἐν Χριστῷ βασιλεῖς.¹ Bréhier concluded that this instance could possibly be not only the first known case, but the actual date of the official introduction of the title into the Byzantine protocol.² Forty-three years later, during which time this conclusion was either ignored, misunderstood, or rejected by almost all scholars who dealt with the history of Byzantine imperial titles, Bréhier restated his opinion in a refined version: "Ce fut Héraclius, après sa victoire sur la Perse, qui modifia le premier le protocole impérial et lui donna la forme définitive qu'il conserva, avec peu de variantes, jusqu'à la fin de l'Empire. . . . Pour la première fois le mot basileus devient le titre légal du souverain et il semble bien que dans la pensée d'Héraclius, ce changement soit comme la consécration de la victoire qu'il a remportée sur celui que se targuait jusque-là d'être le grand roi, l'unique basileus."³

J. B. Bury was the first to make use of this discovery, in a lecture on "The Constitution of the Later Roman Empire."⁴ However, Bury did not make fair use of Bréhier's article. For, after referring to the discovery, he states curiously that Bréhier failed to see the reason for this change of style, "but the significant date A.D. 629 supplies the explanation."⁵ What follows is the explanation that Bury missed (!) in Bréhier's article: "In that year Heraclius completed the conquest of Persia. Now, the Persian king was the only foreign monarch to whom the Roman Emperors conceded the title Basileus; except

¹ C. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Jus Graeco-Romanum*, III (Leipzig, 1857), 44; cf. Zepos, *Jus*, I (Athens, 1931), 36; L. Bréhier, "Le protocole impérial depuis la fondation de l'empire Romain jusqu'à la prise de Constantinople par les Turcs," *CRAI* (1905), 177–82, esp. 179. However, Bréhier investigated the subject more thoroughly in his article, "L'origine des titres impériaux à Byzance—Βασιλεῖς et δεσπότης," *BZ*, 15 (1906), 172–73.

² *Idem*, "L'origine des titres," 173. Recently, N. Oikonomides reconstructed the *intitulatio* of a letter sent by Heraclius to the Great King of Persia Kavadh-Siroe in 628 as follows: Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Φλάβιος Ἡράκλειος πιστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ βασιλεῖς Ῥωμαίων: "Correspondence Between Heraclius and Kavath-Siroe in the Paschal Chronicle (628)," *Byzantion*, 41 (1971), 273. This proposal does not affect Bréhier's argument because the letter of Heraclius is dated after the battle of Ninevah. However, the title βασιλεῖς seems to have been added to current imperial titles by other emperors before Heraclius. Cf. H. Grégoire, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1922), no. 107 (for Justinian); and J.-P. Sodini, "Une titulature faussement attribuée à Justinien I^{er}," *TM*, 5 (1973), 373–84 (for Tiberius). See Appendix, *infra*, p. 72f.

³ L. Bréhier, *Les institutions de l'empire byzantin* (Paris, 1949), 49–50. In this second statement Bréhier avoided combining the assumption of the title with the restitution of the Holy Cross, because he realized that this event most probably occurred in 630; cf. *idem*, *Vie et mort de Byzance* (Paris, 1947), 52.

⁴ *The Creighton Lecture, University College, London, November 12, 1909* (Cambridge, 1910); repr. in *idem, Selected Essays*, ed. H. Temperley (Cambridge, 1930), 99–125.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 109.

the Abyssinian king, who hardly counted. So long as there was a great independent Basileus outside the Roman Empire, the Emperors refrained from adopting a title which would be shared by another monarch. But as soon as that monarch was reduced to the condition of a dependent vassal and there was no longer a concurrence, the Emperor signified the event by assuming officially the title which had for several centuries been applied to him unofficially."⁶ The argument in Bury's explanation, that "Heraclius completed the conquest of Persia" and that the Persian monarch "was reduced to the condition of a dependent vassal," is so obviously erroneous that for its rejection it would be sufficient to refer to what Bury himself had written twenty years earlier, namely that after the battle of Ninevah Heraclius did not conquer Persia, but concluded peace with Chosroes' son Kavādh-Šīroe!⁷ It was, therefore, an easy task for Ernest Stein⁸ to upset this argument when he reviewed the *History* of A. A. Vasiliev, who had adopted Bury's explanation literally and without any reference to Bréhier.⁹ It is important to notice, however, that for Stein, Bury's (and Vasiliev's) explanation is unacceptable, not so much because the Persian king was not really reduced to the condition of a vassal,¹⁰ but because even in this condition he continued to be recognized officially as βασιλεύς, and therefore it would be unreasonable for the Roman emperor to share the same title with his vassal. Thus, it was due to Bury's failure to present his and Bréhier's theory in a reasonable way that later scholars rejected it.

Looking for another, more probable explanation, Stein suggested that "es dürfte sich vielmehr lediglich um eine (vielleicht schon wenige Jahre vor 629 erfolgte) zweckmässige Vereinfachung der Kaisertitulatur handeln, die zugleich der fast vollendeten Gräzisierung der Staates Rechnung trug."^{10a} G. Ostrogorsky, without mentioning Stein (!), fully accepted this opinion, changing only the sequence of the two factors: the assumption of the title of βασιλεύς was a result of the *Gräzisierung* of the Byzantine state and meant a simplification of the imperial title.¹¹

In a long footnote Ostrogorsky repeated Stein's conclusion concerning Bréhier's and Bury's theory. However, he added a further argument of decisive importance which had not been produced by Stein: "...the use of the title of Basileus for foreign rulers before its official adoption by the Byzantine Emperor was of little significance. Basileus had at that time the

⁶ *Ibid.*, 109. Cf. O. Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee* (Jena, 1938; repr. Darmstadt, 1956), 186; and E. Kornemann, *Doppelprinzipat und Reichsteilung im Imperium Romanum* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1933), 156.

⁷ J. B. Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire* (London, 1889), II, 242f.

⁸ Cf. *BZ*, 29 (1930), 353.

⁹ As early as 1917 in the Russian edition, *Lektsii po istorii Vizantii*, I (Petrograd, 1917), 186; cf. the first English edition, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, I (Madison, Wisc., 1928), 241. Vasiliev does not speak of a conquest of Persia, but rightly only of "the successful outcome of the Persian war." However, he quotes Bury, who writes of the "dependent vassal."

¹⁰ ... der (angebliche) Klientelfürst: *op. cit.*, 353.

^{10a} *Ibid.*, 353.

¹¹ *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (Munich, 1963), 89. Cf. W. Ennslein, in *CMH*, IV,2 (Cambridge, 1966), 1f.; and D. Zakythenos, *Βυζαντινὴ Ἱστορία* (Athens, 1972), 144.

same meaning as *rex* and in the early Byzantine period, when the Byzantine ruler had the official title of *Imperator*, it was used not only for the Persian monarch, but for such as Attila and the kings of Armenia and Ethiopia, and sometimes, alternating with other designations, for the Germanic rulers and even the leaders of the Abasgi and Zechi. . . ."¹²

In order to support this argument concerning the imperial title βασιλεύς, Ostrogorsky refers to the evidence collected by Rudolf Helm.¹³ However, the material supplied by Helm does not support Ostrogorsky's far-reaching conclusion. As a matter of fact, the accurate examination of the references produced by Helm without commentary, clarification, or classification¹⁴ does not upset but testifies to the fundamental conclusion already established by A. Gasquet in the last century: that there is a sharp distinction to be made between the literary sources, with their current but not necessarily official terminology, and the imperial documents, which preserve the official usage of titles; and that in the latter we should not expect to find the title *basileus* conceded to any ruler, short of the Roman emperor and the Persian monarch.¹⁵

On the grounds of this basic distinction, the primary aim of this study is to reconsider the evidence concerning the official titles of the rulers of the neighboring states of the Byzantine Empire, for some of whom Ostrogorsky alleged the conferment of the title βασιλεύς. These states can be divided into four groups: I. The states whose sovereignty was never questioned by Byzantium; as we shall see, there was only one such state, Sasanid Persia. II. The national kingdoms located on the periphery of the Empire, in the East; to these belong Armenia, the kingdoms of the Causasian area and the shores of the Black Sea (Iberia, Lazica, Abasgia, Bosphorus), and the kingdoms of East and North Africa (the Ethiopian, Nubian, and Blemyan kingdoms). III. The autonomous satrapies and phylarchies on the periphery but inside the Byzantine frontier, such as the Armenian satrapies and the nomadic Arabic phylarchies of the Syrian desert. IV. The numerous national kingdoms of the barbarian nations of the *Völkerwanderung*, who succeeded in establishing themselves temporarily or permanently on the soil of former Roman provinces with imperial consent; to these belong the Visigoths, the Ostrogoths, the Vandals, the Franks, the Burgundians, the Heruls, and the Lombards, as well as the Huns.

¹² G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. J. Hussey, 2nd ed. (New Brunswick, N.J., 1969), 106 note 2. Cf. I. Shahid, "The Iranian Factor in Byzantium During the Reign of Heraclius," *DOP*, 26 (1972) (hereafter Shahid, "The Iranian Factor"), 299f.

¹³ "Untersuchungen über den auswärtigen diplomatischen Verkehr des römischen Reiches im Zeitalter der Spätantike," *Auf*, 12 (1932), 383 note 2.

¹⁴ In a book review of Helm, "Untersuchungen," G. Ostrogorsky pointed out that the collected material is supplied in too short a way, mainly in the footnotes: "Stellenweise erreicht allerdings die Kürze einen Grad, bei dem sie aufhört eine Tugend zu sein"; cf. *BZ*, 36 (1936), 442.

¹⁵ A. Gasquet, "L'empire d'Orient et l'empire d'Occident. De l'emploi du mot βασιλεύς dans les actes de la Chancellerie byzantine," *RH*, 26 (1884), 281-302. Cf. Th. Nöldeke, *Die Ghassânischen Fürsten aus dem Hause Gafna's*, AbhBerl (Berlin, 1887) (hereafter Nöldeke, *Die Ghassânischen Fürsten*), 12f.; Th. Mommsen, "Ostgothische Studien," *NA*, 14 (1889), 541 (*idem*, *Gesammelte Schriften*, VI [Berlin, 1910], 482).

For the occasion of a Symposium on "Byzantium and Sasanian Iran," held at Dumbarton Oaks in 1970, I. Shahid made a thorough study of the assumption of the title *basileus* by Heraclius.¹⁶ Shahid rejects both Bury's¹⁷ and Ostrogorsky's¹⁸ theories. According to him, the formal assumption of this title mirrors a "constitutional change"¹⁹ for the Empire. It is "related not so much to remote Hellas or foreign Persia as to...Christianity...."²⁰ Nevertheless, it intends to bring "the two empires [Rome and Persia] nearer to each other on the ground of a common concept of sovereignty deriving from kingship...."²¹ Furthermore, Shahid supposes that Heraclius was inspired by his Armenian origin and his affiliations with the Arsacid royal family of Armenia.²²

Shahid's theory is based on an erudite study of several aspects of the subject. However, I cannot accept some of his conclusions. For instance, in spite of the growing impact of Christian ideals on the image of Byzantine "kingship" and political ideology, I hesitate to accept that the assumption of the title may derive from Heraclius' Christian concept of *basileia*. Moreover, the assertion that the title *basileus* was of any help for the development of a Roman-Persian concept of sovereignty should be proposed in the opposite sequence, namely that the mutual recognition of the two states' sovereignty and equality of political rank has eased the process of assimilation of the Persian concept of kingship by the Byzantine emperors. On the other hand, even if one were to accept Shahid's suggestion that Heraclius was of Armenian origin—his argumentation on this point is less than convincing—it seems to me very improbable that the emperor could be influenced by the memory of a local kingship which had been abolished at Byzantine initiative 250 years before.²³

More important is Shahid's proposal to assign to the assumption of βασιλεύς a "constitutional" meaning. I fail to see any constitutional change at work after the battle of Ninevah and think that we should take seriously the fact that no such change has been recorded in the contemporary sources.²⁴ However, the assumption of the title cannot be explained merely as a reduction and simplification of the imperial titles, or as an insignificant novelty in the practice of the imperial chancery; Shahid, therefore, is certainly right in calling our attention to more essential reasons that might have caused or resulted in the assumption of the title βασιλεύς. This problem is discussed in the last part of this study.

¹⁶ "The Iranian Factor," 295–320. For a short report on the Symposium, see R. Frye, in *DOP*, 26, pp. 361–62.

¹⁷ Bury's theory is challenged with the argument that it was not only the Persian king who was conceded the title βασιλεύς: Shahid, "The Iranian Factor," 296–99; however, see *infra*, pp. 59–60.

¹⁸ The theory of Hellenistic influence is rejected as a too narrow (linguistic) phenomenon, whereas the explanation that the new title represents a simplification of former titles is found insufficient to explain the change of titles, because "much more is involved in this change": *ibid.*, 300–2.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 313.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 302.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 306.

²² *Ibid.*, 308–12.

²³ See *infra*, pp. 36–39.

²⁴ Shahid, "The Iranian Factor," 313–17.

I. THE TITLES OF THE GREAT KING OF PERSIA

There can be no doubt that Byzantine-Persian legal relations were established on the grounds of mutual equality and recognition of state sovereignty. Moreover, emperor and Great King respected each other's position as head of state and did not challenge each other's sovereignty even during or after victorious wars.²⁵

The Persian monarch, whose official title was *shahanshah* (king of kings), was officially addressed by the emperor with the title βασιλεύς (in Latin, *rex*), while the emperor was constantly addressed by the Sasanid ruler as *quaisar i Rum*,²⁶ until Chosroes II rendered to Emperor Maurice the title βασιλεύς Ῥωμαίων.²⁷

The fact that the Romans avoided the full title "king of kings" for the Persian monarch is certainly not due to any hesitation in recognizing him as the sovereign of the Iranian state, although the simple form they used was shared by a large number of other "kings" within Persia who were subordinate to the Great King. However, it implies the Roman rejection of the Oriental imperialistic ideology involved in the exclusive title.²⁸ It was therefore only under the pressure of the day that the Senate of Constantinople felt obliged in 615 to render to Chosroes II, who had taken Jerusalem, the title ἀρχιβασιλεύς, a necessary concession in order to avoid his proper title, βασιλεύς βασιλέων. The Senate could not possibly use this title because in the genitive plural βασιλέων would include also Emperor Heraclius, who in the same letter is referred to as βασιλεύς.²⁹

On the other hand, the Persian practice of using the title καῖσαρ for the emperor, even after βασιλεύς had prevailed as the main imperial title of address, was certainly not intended to diminish his sovereign position in the Empire. The title βασιλεύς had to be avoided, not only because it was not in official use, since it was repulsive to the Romans, but also because, used in connection with the exclusive title βασιλεύς βασιλέων of the Persian monarch, it would degrade the emperor to the legal status of the many "kings" who

²⁵ See E. Chrysos, "Some Aspects of Roman-Persian Legal Relations," *Kleronomia*, 8 (1976), 1-56. Cf. K.-H. Ziegler, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich* (Wiesbaden, 1964), 141-53; and also K. Güterbock, *Byzanz und Persien in ihren diplomatisch-völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen im Zeitalter Justinians* (Berlin, 1906), 4-36. Cf. further S. Verosta, "International Law in Europe and Western Asia Between 100 and 650 A.D.," in *Recueil des cours, Académie de droit international*, 113,3 (1964), 524.

²⁶ Καῖσαρ, οὕτω γὰρ τὸν Ῥωμαίων βασιλέα καλοῦσι Πέρσαι: Procopius, *Bella* II.21,9. Cf. Güterbock, *op. cit.*, 6f.; Bréhier, *Les institutions* (note 3 *supra*), 283 note 4.

²⁷ Theophylactos Simocattes, *Historia* IV.11, ed. C. de Boor, Teubner (1887), 169. This was repeated by Kavādh-Sīroe, *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn ed. (1832), 735. For this novelty, see *infra*, pp. 70-71.

²⁸ That the imperialistic ideology was expressed through the exclusive title is shown in the speech of the Persian representative at the Fifty Years' Peace negotiations, who argued that ὡς κατὰ τὸ προσήκον καὶ οὐκ ἀπεικὸς αὐτῷ [i.e., Chosroes] ἡ ἐπωνυμία κεκόμψεται τὸ βασιλέα προσαγορεύεσθαι βασιλέων: Menander, frag. 11, *Excerpta de legationibus*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1903), 177 lines 8-10. The use of this title was impossible in the Christian era because all similar exclusive titles were attributed to the Christian God; E. Chrysos, "The Date of Papyrus SB 4483 and the Persian Occupation of Egypt," *Dodone*, 4 (1975), 344f.

²⁹ *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. Dindorf, I, 708.

were under the authority of the Great King. It was therefore necessary that Chosroes II and Kavādh-Šīroe refrain from using their exclusive title βασιλέως βασιλέων when they rendered the title βασιλεύς to the Emperors Mauricius and Heraclius respectively.³⁰ Moreover, the preference for the title *caesar* instead of the other, more distinctive imperial titles, *imperator* and *augustus*, perhaps was meant to express the hereditary legitimation of the emperor, which was in fact expressed with the *cognomen*;³¹ this aspect of hereditary succession was fundamentally important for the Persian concept of monarchical legitimacy.

II. THE CLIENT KINGDOMS OF THE EMPIRE IN THE EAST

1. Armenia

Armenia was divided into two partial kingdoms under Persian and Byzantine political influence respectively, due to the agreement between the Great King Shapor II and Emperor Valens in 378, until some years later the Armenian kingship was completely abolished.³² It is therefore the period before the abolition of the Armenian kingship to which Ostrogorsky probably refers when he supposes that the Armenian kings were conceded the title βασιλεύς.³³ I. Shahid, who supports Ostrogorsky's argumentation on this point, attributes great importance especially to the nomination of Hannibalianus to the Armenian royal throne by his uncle, Constantine the Great, in 335/36, taking for granted that he was "designated 'king of kings'" and given Armenia and the Pontus.³⁴

There is no doubt that Hannibalianus was nominated *rex* of Armenia. This is witnessed by official coins struck in 336/37 in Constantinople with the inscription FL ANNIBALIANO REGI,³⁵ and is testified also by trustworthy sources like Ammianus Marcellinus, who mentions him with the title *rex*.³⁶ However, there is no evidence available that Hannibalianus was ever officially addressed with the title *basileus*, and therefore we should not hasten to take it for granted, although the nomination of Hannibalianus must have taken place according to the Roman tradition of *appellatio regis*³⁷ which included

³⁰ Cf. *supra*, note 2; and *infra*, pp. 70–71.

³¹ Dio Cassius, *Roman History* LIII.18,2: 'Η γὰρ τοῦ Καίσαρος... πρόσρησις δύναμις μὲν οὐδεμίαν αὐτοῖς οικεῖαν προστίθησι, δηλοῖ δ' ἄλλως τὴν τοῦ γένους σφῶν διαδοχὴν. Cf. Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 4th ed., II,2 (Tübingen, 1952), 770f.; cited by J. Straub, "Dignatio Caesaris," in *Regeneratio Imperii. Aufsätze über Roms Kaisertum und Reich im Spiegel der heidnischen und christlichen Publizistik* (Darmstadt, 1972), 36–63. Cf. John Lydus, *De magistratibus*, III.4: Τὸ γὰρ Καίσαρος ὄνομα γένους ἐστὶ δεικτικὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου Καίσαρος, ὥσπερ Φλαβίων καὶ Κορνηλίων καὶ Φλαβίων καὶ Ἀνικίων, τούτου πρότερον παρὰ βαρβάροις ἠρρημένον. Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου Φαραῶνος τοὺς σφῶν βασιλέας ἐπεφῆμιζον Φαραῶνας, καὶ Πτολεμαίους ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου.

³² On the partition of Armenia, see Chrysos, "Some Aspects," 37. On the abolition of kingship, see K. Güterbock, "Römisch-Armenien und die römischen Satrapieen im vierten bis sechsten Jahrhundert," in *Festschrift Johann Theodor Schirmer* (Königsberg, 1900), 20ff.

³³ *History* (note 12 *supra*), 106 note 2.

³⁴ "The Iranian Factor," 298–99.

³⁵ P. M. Bruun, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, VII (London, 1966), 584, 589–90; cf. J. Maurice, *Numismatique Constantinienne*, I (Paris, 1908), 128–32.

³⁶ *Rerum Gestarum* XIV.1,2: *Hannibaliano regi*.

³⁷ O. F. Winter, "Klientelkönige im römischen und byzantinischen Reich," *JÖBG*, 2 (1952), 36.

the conferment of the title βασιλεύς.³⁸ Nevertheless, the only Greek source that mentions Hannibalianus with his royal title, while describing the ceremony of his investiture, calls him, significantly, not βασιλεύς but ῥήξ.³⁹

The case of Hannibalianus has inspired far-reaching conclusions concerning Byzantine state theory and international relations. Thus, E. Kornemann argued that the appointment of Constantine's nephew to the Armenian throne is the first application of the doctrine that the so-called client kingdoms are part of the Empire, i.e., *reichsangehörig*,⁴⁰ while O. Seeck suggested that the appointment was the first step in Constantine's plan to conquer Persia and to establish his nephew in Ctesiphon as "Great King" of a *Secundogenitur* empire.⁴¹ These conclusions are based on the erroneous information supplied by the *Excerpta Valesiana* that Hannibalianus was appointed not *rex* but *rex regum*, and the supposition that this title is the programmatic manifestation of his claim over the rights of the Sasanid Great King.

The unknown author of the *Excerpta* states in fact that Constantine *Anni-balianum data ei Constantiana filia sua regem regum* [emphasis mine] *et Ponticarum gentiam constituit*.⁴² J. C. Rolfe translated this passage as follows: "Hannibalianus he [Constantine] created King of Kings and ruler of the Pontic tribes,"⁴³ supposing that Constantine's nephew was a) designated "king of kings," i.e., he was given the supreme title of Oriental sovereignty, and b) appointed ruler of the client kingdoms of the Pontus. However, Polemius Silver seems to have understood this sentence more historically when he quoted it without *et*: *Hannibalianum regem regum Ponticarum gentium constituit*,⁴⁴ meaning obviously that he was given royal authority over the kings of the client tribes of the Pontus.

Hannibalianus' appointment to the Armenian throne is certainly connected with the Roman-Persian hostilities in 335 and Constantine's plans for an

³⁸ When Nero crowned Tiridates king of Armenia in Rome in A.D. 66, he spelled the words: βασιλέα (σὲ) τῆς Ἀρμενίας ποιῶ: Dio Cassius, *Roman History* LXII.5,3; cf. Ziegler, *op. cit.* (note 25 *supra*), 74.

³⁹ Ἀννιβαλιανὸν ῥήγα προχειρισάμενος ἐνέδυσσε κοκκηρὰν χλαμύδα καὶ κατὰ Καισάρειαν τῆς Καππαδοκίας ἀπέστειλεν: *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. Dindorf, I, 532; *Chronica minora*, ed. Th. Mommsen (Berlin 1892-98), I, 235, 335 line 2. The investiture with the red (not purple) chlamys mentioned in the Chronicle is probably connected with Hannibalianus' promotion to the rank of *nobilissimus*, as it is testified by Zosimus: . . . καὶ Ἀννιβαλιανὸς ἐσθῆτι χρώμενος κοκκοβαφῇ καὶ περιχύρῳ, τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου νωβελισσίου παρ' αὐτοῦ Κωνσταντίνου τυχόντες ἀξίας αἰδοὶ τῆς συγγενείας: II.39,2, ed. L. Mendelssohn, Teubner (1887), 97 lines 18-21; and ed. F. Paschoud, (Paris, 1971), 112. On the rank of *nobilissimus*, see W. Ensslin, *RE*, 17, col. 791 ff.

⁴⁰ "Die unsichtbaren Grenzen des römischen Kaiserreiches," in *Staaten, Völker, Männer: Das Erbe der Alten*, Ser. II, no. 24 (1934), quoted from the reprint in *idem, Gestalten und Reiche* (Leipzig, 1943), 333: "Von da an ist die neue Lehre geblieben, dass auch das Land der Reichsklienten (Föderaten) in den Grenzgebieten 'reichsangehörig' sei." See, against this theory, E. Chrysos, *Τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ οἱ Γότθοι* (Thessaloniki, 1972), 30 f., 58 f.

⁴¹ *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 2nd ed., IV (Stuttgart, 1911), 7-9. See, against this theory, B. Stallknecht, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Aussenpolitik in der Spätantike (306-395 n. Chr.)* (Bonn, 1969), 37.

⁴² *Pars prior* 6.35, ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH, *AA*, IX,1 (Berlin, 1892), 11 line 5.

⁴³ Cf. his edition of *The History of Ammianus Marcellinus*, III, Loeb (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1939), 529.

⁴⁴ *Laterculus* 63, ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH, *AA*, IX,1 (Berlin, 1892), 522.

effective answer to Shapor's offensive policy in Mesopotamia.⁴⁵ However, we can understand the sources mentioning the nomination of Hannibalianus only if we consider the fact that they connect it with Constantine's decision to divide his empire between his three sons and two nephews.⁴⁶ While the three sons were favored with a part of the imperial territory, the emperor bestowed upon his nephews Roman interests at the periphery of the imperial territory; Dalmatius' jurisdiction consisted of the Gothic federates of the Lower Danube,⁴⁷ while his brother Hannibalianus was authorized to exercise Roman overlordship in the client kingdoms of the East. It is in this way that we have to understand the short but more correct version preserved in the *Epitome de Caesaribus* that Hannibalianus was given *Armeniam nationesque circumsocias*.⁴⁸ Hannibalianus, who was designated king of Armenia in 335 in connection with Constantine's *Ostpolitik*, but did not yet have the chance to exercise his royal rights, was given in 337 the authority over the Pontic client tribes.⁴⁹ This was a Roman appointment, not an Oriental investiture; therefore, there was no reason for the conferment of the title *rex regum*. Moreover, the fact that the official coins with Hannibalianus' effigy,⁵⁰ aiming to advertise imperial policy in the East, do not mention the title *rex regum*, but only the title *rex*, is in my opinion a very strong argument *e silentio* that this title was never given to him. Nevertheless, this does not exclude the possibility that if Hannibalianus had ever actually come to exercise the royal office, which he did not, he might have used all the traditional titles of the Oriental kings, who, in spite of their legal associations, were calling themselves *reges regum*.⁵¹

It is of great importance for our study to underline the fact that Byzantium was first to abolish the kingship in the Roman part of divided Armenia and instead to create a Roman province out of so-called Great Armenia, and was first to establish a new form of constitutional dependence on the emperor

⁴⁵ W. Ensslin, "Zu dem vermuteten Perserfeldzug des rex Annibalianus," *Klio*, 29 (1936), 102–10, esp. 110.

⁴⁶ *Excerpta Valesiana* I.6,35; *Epitome de Caesaribus* 41.21.

⁴⁷ Cf. Chrysos, *Tò Βυζαντινὸν καὶ οἱ Γότθοι*, 72.

⁴⁸ Cf. 41, ed. Fr. Pichlmayr, Teubner (1966), 168.

⁴⁹ Cf. N. H. Baynes, "Rome and Armenia in the Fourth Century," in *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955), 189.

⁵⁰ Silver coins show significantly on the reverse side the river Euphrates seated on the ground holding a scepter in his right hand. The legend reads: SECVRITAS PVBLICA. The bronze coins show the Euphrates reclining at the left, with his left elbow on a water jug and holding a fish in his right and a rudder in his left hand. Here the legend reads: FELICITAS PVBLICA; see Bruun, *op. cit.* (note 35 *supra*), 584, 589–90. It is worth mentioning that on the obverse Hannibalianus wears not the royal tiara but the normal Roman laurel wreath.

⁵¹ B. Stallknecht explained that the title *rex regum* was asserted for Hannibalianus on the basis of a similar measure which Shapor II undertook only a short time before, when he appointed his brother Narseh as king of Armenia: *op. cit.* (note 41 *supra*), 36 ff. However, the alleged appointment of Narseh never took place! Stallknecht was misled by a note in Moses of Chorene's *Armenian History* III.10, according to which Shapor was "planning—but never performed his plan—to appoint Narseh to the Armenian throne"; cf. Ensslin, "Zu dem vermuteten Perserfeldzug," 110; and *idem*, *RE*, 16, cols. 1757–58, s.v. Narses 3. Moreover, if we accept Stallknecht's suggestion that Constantine established with his nephew what Shapor had failed to accomplish with his brother, then we have a further reason to reject the information concerning the title *rex regum*. For Shapor would never give his own title to a subordinate king, even if this king were his own brother.

by appointing a noble of Armenian origin to govern the land with the Roman title of *comes Armeniae*.⁵² Beyond any practical administrative and internal reasons, which might have led to the decision to abolish the kingship in Armenia, there should be no doubt that the new constitutional form was conceived to suit better the hierarchical state order of the dominate as it was developed at the end of the fourth century in East Rome.⁵³ However, this form was changed again by Justinian when his conception of the state order as well as the need for more effective military protection of Armenia during his Persian war called for the transformation of Great Armenia into a Roman province.⁵⁴

2. *The Kingdoms of the Caucasian Area*

In the small client kingdoms, which were located in the Caucasian area, we observe the same trend toward the abolition of the local kingship. However, the development was much slower in this area, no doubt due to the fact that it was too important strategically for both great powers, Persia and Byzantium, and it was therefore permanently an object of discord. Thus, every effort was made by both powers to gain or regain over these kingdoms political, cultural, religious, and, if necessary, military influence. Since, however, subordination to one of the great powers was demonstrated through the appointment and investiture of the client kings,⁵⁵ the emperors could not possibly think of touching the institution of kingship, which could happen only in periods of stability in international relations. Lazica is a characteristic example.

According to the Roman-Persian agreement of 378, which was revalidated in the time of Theodosius I, Lazica, the old Colchis, located in the western part of Georgia and on the eastern coast of the Black Sea, was made a client kingdom of East Rome.⁵⁶ Whenever the royal throne of Lazica was vacant, the legitimate heir would come to Constantinople to express his loyalty and receive from the hands of the emperor the insignia of his dignity.⁵⁷

In the time of Emperor Leon and Great King Perôz, i.e., after 457, Lazica seems to have shifted to Persian domination under conditions unknown to us.⁵⁸ However, things changed again in 522, when the legitimate heir to the throne of Lazica, Tzathes I, came to Constantinople, where he was baptized, married to a Byzantine girl of noble birth, and invested by Justin I.⁵⁹ His

⁵² See Güterbock, "Römisch-Armenien" (note 32 *supra*), 26 ff.

⁵³ See *infra*, pp. 62–63.

⁵⁴ See the detailed study of Güterbock, "Römisch-Armenien," 40–58.

⁵⁵ Cf. Winter, *op. cit.* (note 37 *supra*), 36 f.

⁵⁶ Cf. Chrysos, "Some Aspects," (note 25 *supra*), 45 ff.

⁵⁷ For the investiture of Tzathes I in 522, see Malalas, Bonn ed. (1831), 412 f.; *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. Dindorf, I, 613; and Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, Teubner (1883–85), 168. The investiture of Tzathes II in 555 is described by Agathias III.15.

⁵⁸ This was incidentally mentioned by ambassador Petros to Chosroes I in 561: Τοῦτο τὴν ἰσχὺν ἔλαβεν ἐκ τῶν Θεοδοσίου τοῦ καὶ ἡμᾶς βασιλέως χρόνων μέχρι Περόλου τοῦ ὑμετέρου πάππου καὶ Λέοντος τοῦ καὶ ἡμᾶς: Menander, frag. 3, *Excerpta de legationibus*, ed. de Boor, 187 line 18 f.

⁵⁹ For the evidence, see *supra*, note 3. Cf. A. A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First. An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950) (hereafter Vasiliev, *Justin the First*), 260 ff.; and C. Toumanoff, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington, D.C., 1963), 255 f.

son Gabazes II, who was half Roman by birth, was holding the title of *silentiarius* at the Byzantine court when he succeeded his father to the throne.⁶⁰ In 554, during the Persian war, Gabazes was suspected of collaborating with the enemy and was assassinated. To his throne Justinian invested his brother Tzathes II,⁶¹ who is the last known king of Lazica.⁶²

The Greek sources usually apply the term βασιλεύς to the Lazic kings. Even in the official protocol of the negotiations concerning the future of Suania, which the Byzantine ambassador carried on with Chosroes I after the conclusion of the peace treaty in 561, as it is preserved by Menander, the ambassador mentioned the Lazic ruler with the title βασιλεύς.⁶³ However, he seems to have avoided using the same term for the kinglet of Suania, whose title was also βασιλεύς, calling him instead ἄρχων,⁶⁴ ἡγεμών,⁶⁵ or βασιλίσκος.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, no official documents are preserved to supply positive evidence that the term βασιλεύς was officially conceded to the king of Lazica by the imperial court.

However, after the end of the Persian war and the conclusion of the Fifty Years' Peace Treaty of 561, according to which Lazica was definitely assigned to the Empire, since the Great King had abandoned his claims,⁶⁷ the next we hear about this country is that the kingship was abolished and replaced by the institution of the "Presiding Prince," who had local origin but served the Byzantine Empire with the title of a Roman *patricius*.⁶⁸

The destiny of the Lazic kingdom was shared almost at the same time by the other client states of the Caucasian area, which after the end of the great wars were assigned to the Empire. Thus in Iberia, the neighbor of Lazica in the East, the kingship was abolished in 588 when the land passed to Byzantine allegiance after a changeful history of partition between Persia and Byzantium and reunification under Persian or Byzantine protection, or even occupation.⁶⁹ Instead of having kings, Iberia was given "Presiding Princes" of local origin whose legitimation for ruling their country was based on their title of Byzantine curopalate.⁷⁰

As far as we can see, a similar process was undergone by the other kingdoms of the Caucasus, such as Abasgia and Albania.⁷¹ Anyway, by the end of the

⁶⁰ The evidence for his title is in Procopius, *Bella* II.29,31.

⁶¹ For the evidence, see *supra*, note 2. Cf. B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians* (Berlin, 1960) (hereafter Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*), 362f.

⁶² Cf. Toumanoff, *op. cit.*, 255.

⁶³ Λαζών βασιλεῖς, Menander, frag. 3, *passim*. Although Menander seems to preserve faithfully the official version of the minutes, nevertheless the terms used during the negotiations should not be taken as expressing the official usage of the imperial court or the king's chancery. This explains how Chosroes could use the term βασιλεύς in connection with Justinian (τῷ καὶ ὑμᾶς βασιλεῖ) without breaking the tradition of not applying this term to the emperor.

⁶⁴ Ὅτι ψήφω τοῦ Λαζών βασιλέως ὁ Σουανίας ἄρξων τὸ κύρος ἐδέχετο: Menander, frag. 3, *Excerpta de legationibus*, ed. de Boor, 184 lines 5–6; cf. 187 line 13.

⁶⁵ Λαζών βασιλεῖς, οἱ Σουάνων χειροτόνησαν ἡγεμόνας: *ibid.*, 187 line 22; cf. 184 line 7.

⁶⁶ Οἱ γε Λαζών βασιλεῖς, οἱ γε βασιλίσκους ἐπέστησαν Σουάνοις: *ibid.*, 187 line 24.

⁶⁷ Güterbock, *Byzanz und Persien* (note 25 *supra*), 60f.; Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 369f.

⁶⁸ For the evidence, see Toumanoff, *op. cit.*, 255 note 355; and *idem*, "Armenia and Georgia," in *CMH*, IV,1 (1966), 603.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 597–603.

⁷⁰ The character of the institution of the Principate, or rule by presiding princes, is discussed in *idem*, *Studies*, 384–89.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 256f.

sixth century there were no more vassal "states" under Byzantine domination in the East ruled by "kings."

3. *The Bosphoran Kingdom*

The kingdom of the Crimean Bosphorus was the last survival of the Hellenistic kingdoms of the East which for centuries were tolerated by Rome because it was considered more practical to preserve their constitutional form than to incorporate them into the imperial territory as Roman provinces.

The kings of the Bosphorus were allowed to use the traditional Hellenistic title βασιλεύς on their coins,⁷² while in inscriptions we also find other Oriental titles, such as βασιλεύς βασιλέων, βασιλεύς τοῦ σύμπαντος Βοσπόρου καὶ τῶν πέριξ ἔθνων, μέγας βασιλεύς, etc.⁷³ On inscriptions dedicated to or referring to Roman emperors, the bombastic titles are never used; instead they limit themselves to the title βασιλεύς.⁷⁴

However, the barbarian invasions from the north (Goths) and the east (Huns) destroyed the Bosphoran kingdom. The last king known to have struck coins with the title βασιλεύς is Phescaporis VI in 332.⁷⁵

From the period of Hunnic rule over the lands of the northwestern Black Sea we hear that in the time of Justin I the citizens of the city of Bosphorus decided to ask for the emperor's protection.⁷⁶ Next we hear that the Hunnic King Grod himself appeared in Constantinople and asked to be baptized. Justinian functioned as godfather and sent the new convert to his country, authorizing him to defend the Roman possessions and the Bosphorus. For our subject, it is important that Malalas, our source, and Theophanes, who follows him, call the Hunnic ruler ῥήξ.⁷⁷

Some scholars date to the time of Justinian an inscription found in Kertsch, which refers to the building of a tower in the time of King Diuptunus.⁷⁸ Gajdukevič recently went so far as to suggest that after reconquering the Crimean Bosphorus, Justinian established Diuptunus as a descendent of the old royal family of the Tiberii Julii, as king of the Bosphoran kingdom.⁷⁹ If Gajdukevič's theory were correct, we would have the interesting case of the restoration of a client kingdom in the sixth century. However, many old

⁷² Usually Bosphoran coins have the king's effigy with his name and the title βασιλεύς, and on the reverse the figure of the Roman emperor; W. Wroth, *Catalogue of Greek Coins*, XIII: *Pontus, Paphlagonia, Bithynia and the Kingdom of Bosphorus* (London, 1889), 80f.

⁷³ V. V. Struve, *Korpus Bosporskikh nadpisej* (Moscow, 1965), e.g., nos. 28–34, 39–40, 44–45, 53–56, 59, 979–80, 1008, 1010, 1048–49.

⁷⁴ In these cases they call themselves βασιλεύς N. N. φιλοκαῖσαρ καὶ φιλορώμαιος, εὐσεβῆς (and quite often ἀρχιερεὺς Σεβαστῶν, since the kings functioned usually as high priests at the emperor's divine service); cf. *ibid.*, nos. 38, 41, 47–48, 52, 978, 1047. In Latin the titles are *Rex N. N. amicus imperatoris populique Romani*; cf. *ibid.*, no. 46. Cf. also B. Latyshev, *Inscriptiones regni Bosphorani Graecae et Latinae*, II (St. Petersburg, 1880; repr. Hildesheim, 1965), no. 40.

⁷⁵ V. Gajdukevič, *Das Bosphoranische Reich* (Berlin, 1971), 481.

⁷⁶ Procopius, *Bella* I.12,7–8, ed. J. Haury and G. Wirth, Teubner, I (1963), 57 lines 4–6.

⁷⁷ Malalas, Bonn ed., 431 line 16f.; Theophanes, ed. de Boor, 175 line 24f.

⁷⁸ ... ἐπὶ Τιβερίου Ἰουλίου Διουπτοῦνο[υ] βασιλ(έως) Εὐσεβο(ῦς) φιλοκέσαρος καὶ (φ)ιλορωμέου: Latyshev, *op. cit.*, addenda, no. 49; Struve, *op. cit.*, no. 67; cf. E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* (Cambridge, 1913), 610, who dates the inscription to the second half of the fourth century.

⁷⁹ *Op. cit.*, 517.

Bosporan elements make this date for the inscription very improbable. It is written in the old style of the second to third century, it mentions public offices of the old Bosporan kingdom, such as ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς πινακίδος and ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ πρωτεύοντος, and it is dated according to the Bosporan calendar. On the other hand, it is much more probable to regard Tiberius Julius Diuptunus as one of the members of the royal dynasty of the Bosporus of the Roman period, instead of pressing the evidence with the suggestion that he was a sixth-century descendant of the old royal family.

When at the end of the sixth century Maurice restored Byzantine domination in the Crimea, the inscriptions that were to commemorate his rebuilding activity were made by the *dux* of Cherson!⁸⁰

In the year 619 the ruler of the Huns, who lived in the area of the former Bosporan kingdom, repeated Grod's action and came to Constantinople, together with his court and his bodyguard, asking to be baptized. Emperor Heraclius received him with high honors and gifts and conceded to him the title of a Roman *patricius*. Patriarch Nicephorus, our single source, calls the Hunnic ruler precisely ὁ τῶν Οὐννων τοῦ ξθνους κύριος καὶ ἡγεμών,⁸¹ but not βασιλεύς.

4. The African Kingdoms

The Abyssinian king has already been mentioned by Bury as an "exception which hardly counts" to the rule that the Persian king was the only foreign monarch to whom the Roman emperors conceded the title *basileus*.⁸² It is true that the majority of the Greek literary sources call the monarch of Ethiopia βασιλέα Αἰθιοπίας or Ἀξωμιτῶν,⁸³ as they also do the "sub"-kings dependent on the Abyssinian king.⁸⁴ However, the literary sources do not attest that the title βασιλεύς was also used officially by the imperial chancery. We do not possess any official document, or any reliable account of such a document in the sources, in which the imperial court would use this title for the Abyssinian king.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ +Πρὸς τοῖς λοιποῖς μεγάλαις καὶ θαυμαστοῖς κατορθώμασι καὶ τότε τὸ λαμπρὸν ἐν Βοσπόρῳ καיסάριον ἀνεγένωσεν Μ(αυρ)ίκιος ὁ εὐσεβέστατος καὶ θεοφύλακτος ἡμῶν δεσπότης διὰ τοῦ γνησίου αὐτοῦ δούλου Εὐπατερίου τοῦ ἐνδοξοτάτου στρατηλάτου καὶ δουκὸς Χερσῶνος, Ἰνδικτιῶνος η': *ibid.*, 518.

⁸¹ *Historia*, ed. C. de Boor, Teubner (1880), 12 lines 20–28.

⁸² See *supra*, pp. 31–32.

⁸³ Procopius, *Bella* I.20; Malalas, Bonn ed., 457f.; Theophanes, ed. de Boor, 244; Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographie chrétienne* XI.4, 7, ed. W. Wolska-Conus, SC, 197 (Paris, 1973), 321, 337.

⁸⁴ See, for instance, Procopius, *Bella* I.19,3, for the Homerite king; and Cosmas Indicopleustes XI.13, ed. Wolska-Conus, 343, for the two kings on the island of Taprorane.

⁸⁵ We have two inaccurate reports of diplomatic procedure between Constantinople and Aksum in the sixth century, but they fail to supply us with evidence for the official use of the title *basileus*. The first report is quoted by Tabari from two Arab traditions of the eighth and ninth centuries recalling an alleged audience given by Emperor Justin I to an ambassador of the Abyssinian king Elesbaas. According to Th. Nöldeke's German translation (*Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden aus der arabischen Chronik des Tabari* [Leyden, 1879], 189–90), "... der Kaiser Fürst der Römer," said to the ambassador: "ich will für dich an den König von Habes schreiben ... So gab ihm der Kaiser einen Brief an den König von Habes mit, ... Als nun Daus Dhû Tha'labân mit dem Brief des Kaisers zum Nağâšî, dem Fürsten von Habes, kam, ..." According to the French translation of H. Zotenberg (*Chronique*, II [Paris, 1869], 181–82): "L'empereur écrivit donc au Nedjâschî, le roi d'Abyssinie." It is important to note that the original Arabic text uses the words *qaisar*, *sâhib al-Rum* for the emperor (the traditional expression, which the Arabs took from the Persians), while the Abyssinian king is *malik* (the Semitic word for king) or *najâshî*, *sâhib al Habashâ* (the traditional royal title in the

On the other hand, we do possess an imperial document, in which the title is clearly missing. It is the letter of Emperor Constantius II addressed to King Aizanes of Abyssinia, which is incorporated in the *Apologia ad Constantium* of Athanasius of Alexandria.⁸⁶ The *intitulatio* of the letter, as preserved by Athanasius, is Νικητῆς Κωνσταντίου Μέγιστος Σεβαστὸς Ἀἰζανῆ καὶ Σαζανῆ, that is, without any titles for the Abyssinian monarch and his coregent. Only at the end of the letter Constantius calls the receivers ἀδελφοὶ τιμιώτατοι. Nevertheless, it is very interesting for our discussion that in introducing this letter, together with another letter of Constantius to the Alexandrians, Athanasius calls the leaders of Aksum τύραννοι.⁸⁷

A. Dihle, discussing this "title" in a study on the missionary bishop of Abyssinia, Frumentius, and King Aizanes, has rightly pointed out that this word, beside its meaning of usurper, is used in the literature as a *vox media* applying to barbarian rulers, especially to those of Africa, without the meaning of usurper.⁸⁸ With this general meaning the word is used in the official bilingual inscription made in 29 B.C. by Cornelius Gallus, the first Roman governor of Egypt, on the island of Philae. In this inscription a distinction is made between the βασιλεῖς-reges and the τύραννοι-tyranni.⁸⁹ Moreover, Diodorus of Sicily describes the social life of the Troglodyte-Nubians as βίον ἔχοντες ἀπὸ θρεμμάτων νομαδικῶν κατὰ συστήματα τυραννοῦνται καὶ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων τὰς γυναῖκας ἔχουσι κοινὰς πλὴν μιᾶς τῆς τοῦ τυράννου.⁹⁰ With the same meaning the word is applied by the anonymous author of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, who is again distinguishing between the (Roman) αὐτοκράτωρ, the (Abyssinian) ἐνθεσμος βασιλεὺς, and the minor τύραννοι.⁹¹ Dihle explains the use of τύραννοι in the Apology of Athanasius

Ethiopian language); cf. *Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed ibn Djarir at-Tabari*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, ser. 1, vol. II (Leyden, 1881–82), 927.

On the other hand, according to the *Martyrium S. Arethae*, the emperor asked the Patriarch Timothy of Alexandria to write to Elesbaas and to suggest that he attack the king of the Homerites: Τὰ κινήθεντα εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰουστίνου βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων, ὃς παραυτίκα γράμματα ἐποίησεν πρὸς Τιμόθεον, τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Ἀλεξανδρείας, ὅπως γράψῃ ἡ αὐτοῦ δσιότης καὶ ὑπὸ λόγον ποιήσῃ πρὸς Ἐλεσβαν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Αἰθιοπῶν, ὅπως στρατοπεδαρχήσας ἐξαλείψῃ πάντας τοὺς παρανόμους μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν: *ActaSS, Octobris*, X (1869), 743. In his letter to Elesbaas Timothy calls him ἡ σὴ ἀδελφότης and ἡ σὴ δσιότης, what Vasiliev erroneously translates as "your majesty"; cf. *Justin the First*, 294. In these reports, which cannot be considered as recalling the official terminology, it is essential to note that not only the Abyssinian but also the dependent rulers are called βασιλεῖς.

⁸⁶ Ed. J.-M. Szymusiak, SC, 56 (Paris, 1958), 125. The fact that this letter is incorporated in a treatise addressed to the emperor elevates its credentials of authenticity.

⁸⁷ Γέγραπται τοῖς ἐν Ἀξούμει τυράννοις: *ibid.*, 121; & δὲ καὶ Φρουμεντίου χάριν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ἀξούμειως γέγραπται τοῖς ἐκεῖ τυράννοις: *ibid.*, 124.

⁸⁸ *Umstrittene Daten. Untersuchungen zum Auftreten der Griechen am Roten Meer*, Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 32 (Cologne, 1965), 52–54: "Das Wort . . . verwendet man ferner gern, um einen Barbarenherrscher zu bezeichnen, ohne dass dadurch dessen Rechtmässigkeit angezweifelt würde." Nevertheless, Dihle's suggestion that this meaning is implied in the word τύραννος, used by Sozomenos, *Historia Ecclesiastica* I.19,3 and II.15,3, is not correct. In this context the word most probably means the "unworthy" monarchs who were defeated by Constantine before A.D. 325, i.e., Maxentius and Licinius.

⁸⁹ E. Bernard, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines de Philae*, II: *Haut et Bas Empire* (Paris, 1968), no. 128.

⁹⁰ *Bibliothecae historicae* III.39,1.

⁹¹ *Periplus maris Erythraei*, ed. H. Frisk (Göteborg, 1927), chaps. 2, 14, 16, 20, 22, together with chaps. 23, 24, and 31. Cf. W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, II (Leipzig, 1905), no. 654, p. 364 note 12: *Regulos qui in Aethiopia et aliis regionibus Aegypto finitimis ita imperabant, ut superioris alicuius regis (aut populi Romani) dicioni subiungerentur*, τυράννος appellari consue-

as implying the exotic character of the Ethiopian milieu. However, beyond this meaning, which seems to have been attached to the word for centuries, it later came to be used as a technical term meaning φύλαρχος (which is never applied in the sources for Abyssinian conditions, but is well documented for the Blemyan and the Arab leaders) or more often βασιλίσκος (which is actually used by the same Aizanes, the receiver of Constantius' letter, in a trilingual inscription dedicated to his victorious expeditions).⁹² In this inscription Aizanes calls his enemies βασιλίσκοι, while he uses for himself the title βασιλεύς, which follows a long tradition of the Ethiopian chancery.⁹³

The explanation suggested for the title τύραννος in connection with βασιλεύς, βασιλίσκος, and φύλαρχος becomes more probable when one considers the conditions existing in the "kingdoms" of the Blemyes and the Nubians in the sixth century. In a remarkable inscription set up in the time of Justinian by the king of the Nubians, Silka, to commemorate his victories over a number of enemies, he calls himself βασιλίσκος Νουβάδων καὶ ὄλων τῶν Αἰθιοπῶν(!), while he mentions his enemies as βασιλεῖς καὶ δεσπότες.⁹⁴ Bury does not take seriously Silko's title βασιλίσκος: "The Greek who composed the inscription," he argues, "must have smiled to himself when he introduced the diminutive βασιλίσκος, 'kinglet.'"⁹⁵ This explanation, however, is not acceptable, since it presupposes

scimus ex Periplo maris Erythraei. S. Hable-Selassie's explanation that the term is used in the *Periplus* "für jene Herrscher, die keine dynastische Sukzession haben" (*Beziehungen Äthiopiens zur Griechisch-Römischen Welt* [Bonn, 1964], 54) cannot be proved. F. Altheim understands the term τύραννος in the meaning of usurper, because he attempts to prove that the Ezana of the inscription is not identical with the recipient of Constantius' letter: *Geschichte der Hunnen* (Berlin, 1962), V, 167f.; cf. F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, *Die Araber in der alten Welt*, II (Berlin, 1965), 296, who make the interesting suggestion that the Greek word τύραννος might be a curious translation of the Ethiopian term *makuānēnēt*, which in fact means the judge (-iudices); cf. also *ibid.*, IV (1967), 510f. Here Altheim's and Stiehl's argument that Athanasius intentionally confronts the emperor's expression ἀδελφοὶ τιμώτατοι with the τύραννοι, i.e., illegitimate rulers, can easily be upset. In his *Apology* the bishop of Alexandria would never offend the imperial ears by calling the Ethiopian rulers, who were honored by the emperor with the title ἀδελφοί, usurpers.

⁹² F. Bilabel and E. Kiessling, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, V,3 (Wiesbaden, 1950), no. 8546.

⁹³ The Abyssinian king calls himself officially βασιλεύς, as testified by the coins (A. Kammerer, *Essai sur l'histoire antique d'Abyssinie* [Paris, 1926], 154-70) and by inscriptions (E. Littmann, *Deutsche Aksum-Expedition*, IV [Berlin, 1913]; F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, "Die Datierung des Königs 'Ēzānā von Aksūm," *Klio*, 39 [1961], 234-48, esp. 241, 244; Altheim and Stiehl, *Die Araber*, V,2 [1969], 167ff.). Aizanes called himself βασιλεύς βασιλέων even before he was converted to Christianity: Bilabel and Kiessling, *op. cit.*, no. 8546. For the origins of this title, see W. Vycichl, "Le titre de roi des rois—negusä nägäšt. Etude historique et comparative sur la monarchie en Ethiopie," *AnnEth*, 2 (1957), 193-203; and A. Caquot, "La royauté sacrée en Ethiopie," *ibid.*, 206f. In the restored Abyssinian kingdom after A.D. 1270 up to the "emperor" Haile Selassie I of our days this remained the official title; cf. E. Hammerschmidt, *Äthiopien* (Wiesbaden, 1967), 151f.

⁹⁴ Ἐγὼ Σιλκῶ, βασιλίσκος Νουβάδων καὶ ὄλων τῶν Αἰθιοπῶν, ἦλθον εἰς Τάλμιν καὶ Τάφιν. ἄπαξ δύο [for δις] ἐπολέμησα μετὰ τῶν Βλεμύων, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκεν μοι τὸ νίκημα. μετὰ τῶν τριῶν ἄπαξ ἐνίκησα πάλιν καὶ ἐκράτησα τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν. ἐκαθέσθην μετὰ τῶν ὄχλων μου τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἄπαξ, ἐνίκησα αὐτῶν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤξιωσάν με. ἐποίησα εἰρήνην μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ὤμοσαν μοι τὰ εἰδωλα αὐτῶν. . . . ὅτε ἐγεγονέμην βασιλίσκος, οὐκ ἀπῆλθον ὅλως ὀπίσω τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων, ἀλλὰ ἀκμὴν ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν. . . . οἱ δεσπότες τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν, οἱ φιλονεικοῦσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ ἄφω αὐτοὺς καθεσθῆναι εἰς τὴν σκιάν. . . : Bilabel and Kiessling, *op. cit.*, no. 8536; cf. G. Lefebvre, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques-chrétiennes d'Égypte* (Cairo, 1907), no. 628.

⁹⁵ *Later Roman Empire* (note 7 *supra*), II, 330 note 1. The same interpretation of the term βασιλίσκος is provided for a fifth-century reference by F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, who analyzed a passage in Palladius, *De vita Bragmanorum Narratio*, I.4 (ed. I. Duncan and M. Derrett, in *ClMed*, 21 [1960], 109: καὶ διαπλεύσας μετὰ πρεσβυτέρου ταύτην κατέλαβε πρότερον τὴν Ἀδουλήν, εἶτα μετ' ἐκείνην τὴν Αὐζούμην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ βασιλίσκος μικρὸς τῶν Ἰνδῶν ἐκεῖ καθεζόμενος). Altheim and Stiehl concluded: "Palladius . . .

that Silko was not aware of the real meaning of the titles attributed to him by the Greek who composed the inscription at his order. On the other hand, if we identify Silko's enemies with the Romans, as Vasiliev did,⁹⁶ we obtain in this inscription interesting evidence for an arrogant Nubian phylarch who pretends to rule over "all Ethiopians" and still calls his Roman imperial enemies βασιλεῖς καὶ δεσπότες, while he is contented with the title βασιλίσκος.

In two other inscriptions on gazelle leather probably from the same period found in Gebelein, the king of the Blemyes calls himself also βασιλίσκος.⁹⁷ In the first inscription the terms φύλαρχος and ὑποτύραννος⁹⁸ are also used. Thus, βασιλίσκος is the ruler while φύλαρχος is the chief of a district. What is quite amazing, though, is that the man under the φύλαρχος is not called ὑποφύλαρχος but ὑποτύραννος. This implies that φύλαρχος is another term for τύραννος, the chief under the sovereign. Krall explains the term βασιλίσκος convincingly as "ein Zugeständnis an das byzantinische Staatsrecht," and as "ein Bekenntnis der Unterordnung unter eine höhere Macht."⁹⁹ This higher power must be the Empire, which had to pay annual *curatoria* to the Blemyes.

According to Procopius, the Emperor Diocletian concluded a treaty with the Blemyes and the Nubians. They promised to remain peaceful and the Empire was to pay to them annually a certain amount in gold.¹⁰⁰ Even if this treaty was not concluded at the time of Diocletian, but at a later date,¹⁰¹ it shows the character of Byzantine-Blemyan relations and makes it very probable that Silko and his royal colleagues called themselves βασιλίσκοι as a necessary concession to Byzantium, since they belonged to the nations ὅσοι τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀσπάζονται δεσποτεῖαν.¹⁰²

These conclusions on Ethiopian royal titles in connection with the titles of the small "kingdoms" of the Nubians and the Blemyes does not mean that those rulers were considered by the Byzantines to be equal. There was certainly a very clear distinction made between the great and powerful kingdom of Aksum and the vassal phylarchies on the periphery of the Empire in Africa, whose allegiance was guaranteed through diplomatic activity, *foedera*, *curatoria*, and missionary work. To the latter phylarchies we should add the Maurish tribes living on the edge of the Roman provinces in North Africa. Procopius reports from the Vandal war that the Maurish chiefs went to Beli-

bezeichnet Aksum als unbedeutendes Königtum, seinen Herrscher als βασιλίσκος μικρός": *Christentum am Roten Meer*, I (Berlin-New York, 1971), 402.

⁹⁶ *Justin the First*, 286f.

⁹⁷ J. Krall, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Blemyer und Nubier*, DenkWien, Phil.-hist. Kl., 46,4 (Vienna, 1900), 415. Cf. C. Wessely, *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde*, VIII: *Griechische Papyrusurkunden kleineren Formats* (Leipzig, 1908; repr. Amsterdam, 1965), nos. 132, 133.

⁹⁸ Ἐγὼ Χαράχην βασιλίσκος τῶν Βλεμύων γράφω τοῖς τέκνοις Χαράχην Χαραπατχοῦρ καὶ Χαραζιέτ ὥστε κελεύω καὶ δεδωκέναι τῆς κουρατωρίας τῆς νήσου λεγομένης Τάναρε καὶ οὐδεὶς κελεύεται κωλύσαι ὑμᾶς ἐὰν δὲ ἀγνομονοῦσιν οἱ Ῥωμαῖς μὴ παρέχουσιν συνήθεια ὁ φύλαρχος οὐ κωλύσεται οὐδέ ὁ ὑποτύραννος κρατῆσαι Ῥωμαῖς ἕως πληρώνεται τὰς συνήθειας τῆς νήσου μου Χαράχην βασιλίσκος(ος)...: Wessely, *ibid.*, no. 132.

⁹⁹ *Op. cit.*, 6.

¹⁰⁰ *Bella I*, 19, 29–36; cf. Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 287.

¹⁰¹ See E. Honigsmann's review of Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, in *Byzantion*, 20 (1950), 347.

¹⁰² Theodoretus, *Graecorum affectionum curatio*, PG, 83, col. 1037. Cf. A. Vasiliev, "Justin I and Abyssinia," *BZ*, 33 (1933), 67: "Byzantium considered Abyssinia a vassal state." On the importance of this passage, see Stallknecht, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Aussenpolitik* (note 41 *supra*), 27.

sarius asking for the insignia of their legitimacy as an expression of their loyalty to the emperor and their decision to support the imperial army. They maintained that to receive τὰ ξύμβολα τῆς ἀρχῆς from the Romans was an old tradition, which was broken when the Vandals occupied North Africa.¹⁰³

III. THE ROMAN SATRAPIES AND PHYLARCHIES

1. *The Armenian Satrapies*

According to the Roman-Persian peace treaty of A.D. 363 the satrapies Ingilena and Sophena remained under Roman control. After the partition of Armenia later in the fourth century, four more satrapies, Anzitena, Asthianena, Sophanena, and Balabitenä, were added. These six remained under the same political conditions until Justinian created from them the province *Armenia quarta* in A.D. 536.¹⁰⁴

The satrapies were political units under "princes" of hereditary succession and local origin, who were invested and recognized as "viceroys" by the emperor.¹⁰⁵ The satraps were recipients of imperial orders (edicts) and paid taxes in the form of *aura coronaria*.¹⁰⁶

C. Toumanoff thinks that the term "satrap" was a Roman bureaucratic misnomer for the princes.¹⁰⁷ However, this is not true. The Persian term satrap was the official title of these ruling princes (in Greek σατράπης, in Latin *satrapes* [or *-a*]) witnessed in imperial edicts.¹⁰⁸ The Roman satrapies created by the Persians are no doubt the most significant example of political administrative forms which the Empire found in the East and copied.

2. *The Arab Phylarchies*

The nomadic Arab tribes living throughout the desert of Syria and Palestine, i.e., on the periphery of the southeastern Roman provinces, enjoyed the great amount of autonomy to which nomadic peoples have been accustomed, even in our own day.¹⁰⁹ Their chiefs had no administrative or political competence entrusted to them by the Roman state, but they were, nevertheless, recognized

¹⁰³ Νόμος γὰρ ἦν Μαυρουσίῳ ἀρχεῖν μηδένα, κὰν Ῥωμαίοις πολέμιος ᾗ, πρὶν ἂν αὐτῷ τὰ γνωρίσματα τῆς ἀρχῆς ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς δοίη: *Bella* III.25,5.

¹⁰⁴ Justinian, *Novel* 31.1; cf. *Codex Justinianus* I.29,5, and Procopius, *De aedificiis*, III.1,17; Güterbock, "Römisch-Armenien" (note 32 *supra*), 29–39; A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1971), 244f., 445f. Cf. N. G. Garsoïan, "Armenia in the Fourth Century. An attempt to Re-Define the Concepts 'Armenia' and 'Loyalty,'" *REArm*, N.S. 8 (1971), 344, with a different understanding of the legal position of the satrapies.

¹⁰⁵ Güterbock, "Römisch-Armenien," 33f.

¹⁰⁶ *Codex Theodosianus* 12.13,6 (A.D. 387), addressed to *Gaddanae satrapae Sofanenae*.

¹⁰⁷ "Armenia and Georgia," *CMH*, IV,1, p. 595 note 3.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. the legal texts, *supra*, notes 1 and 3.

¹⁰⁹ From the large bibliography on the "Roman" Arabs, see Nöldeke, *Die Ghassânischen Fürsten*, 4–52; R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Eglise jusqu'à la conquête arabe* (Paris, 1944), 241–82; P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam. I: Byzance et l'Orient* (Paris, 1951), 248–72; S. Smith, "Events in Arabia in the 6th Century A.D.," *BSOAS*, 16 (1954), 425–68; I. Kavar, "The Arabs in the Peace Treaty of A.D. 561," *Arabica*, 3 (1956), 181–213; *idem*, "Procopius and Arethas," *BZ*, 50 (1957), 39–67, 362–82; R. Paret, "Note sur un passage de Malalas concernant les phylarchs arabes," *Arabica*, 5 (1958), 251–62; Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Justinians*, 268–79 and notes on 488–95.

as the leaders of their tribes on the battlefield and in affairs included in their autonomy. In the Greek and even the Latin sources the title of the chief is φύλαρχος-*phylarchus*,¹¹⁰ although sometimes he is also called στρατηγός,¹¹¹ ἐθνάρχης,¹¹² or simply Ἀράβων ἡγούμενος.¹¹³

Procopius is again exceptional and reports that the phylarch Arethas (al-Hārīṭ b. Jabalah) was invested by Justinian as a "king": Διὸ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἰουστινιανὸς φυλαῖς ὅτι πλείσταις Ἀρέθαν τὸν Γαβαλᾶ παῖδα ἐπέστησεν, ὃς τῶν ἐν Ἀραβίοις Σαρακηνῶν ἤρχεν, ἀξίωμα βασιλέως αὐτῷ περιθέμενος, οὐ πρότερον τοῦτο ἐν γε Ῥωμαίοις γεγονὸς πώποτε.¹¹⁴

Th. Nöldeke, in his important *Abhandlung* on the Ghassânid princes, holding to the truth that the title βασιλεὺς was officially used within the Empire only for the emperor, rejected Procopius' information and pointed out that the evidence preserved in inscriptions and literary sources for Arethas and his successors gives them only the titles of *phylarch* and *patricius*.¹¹⁵ Thus, R. Devreesse does not discuss Procopius' trustworthiness on this point. Nevertheless, considering the unanimous evidence against him, he avoids mentioning Arethas with the royal title.¹¹⁶

I. Kavar, in his numerous and extensive articles on the "Roman" Arabs of the sixth century, sees the conferment of βασιλεία on Arethas, however, not as the recognition of his sovereignty, since Arethas remained functionally a phylarch, but as meant to serve a very special purpose among the Arabs in Syria, namely as a counterbalance to Lahmid Moundhir.¹¹⁷ For this explanation he abandons Nöldeke's basic point that the title was officially preserved only for the emperor,¹¹⁸ and, in this way, his only problem is to interpret Procopius' statement that οὐ πρότερον τοῦτο ἐν γε Ῥωμαίοις γεγονὸς πώποτε. He finds, therefore, an intelligent explanation: Procopius is purposely wrong,

¹¹⁰ Sextus Rufus, *Breviarium* chap. 14: *phylarchi Saracenorum* (in the time of Lucullus' expedition, 69–67 B.C.). For further references, see Paret, *op. cit.*, 252 note 2. In order to distinguish the "Roman" phylarch from his Persian opposite, Malalas calls him φύλαρχος Ῥωμαίων: *Chronographia*, Bonn ed., 434 line 23.

¹¹¹ W. H. Waddington, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie* (Paris, 1870), no. 2112.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, no. 2196.

¹¹³ Evagrius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV.12, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier (London, 1898), 162 line 27; VI.2, p. 223 line 21; Theophylactos Simocattes, *Historia* III.17.7, ed. de Boor, 146 line 10.

¹¹⁴ *Bella* I.18.47, ed. Haury and Wirth, I, 90 lines 12–16.

¹¹⁵ *Die Ghassânischen Fürsten*, 12–15. In addition to the inscriptions of Arethas' son Moundhir, quoted by Nöldeke, which call him Φλ(άβιος) Ἀλαμούνδαρος ὁ πανεύφημος πατρικ(ί)ος καὶ φύλαρχος (Waddington, *op. cit.*, nos. 2562c, 2110), D. Schlumberger discovered an inscription at the Qasr el-Heir monastery dated to A.D. 559, speaking of the φυλαρχία τοῦ εὐδοξοτάτου Ἀρέθα... πατρικίου: "Les fouilles de Qasr el-Heir el-gharbi," *Syria*, 20 (1939), 368–72.

¹¹⁶ "Pour eux, à quoi correspondait exactement cet ἀξίωμα βασιλέως conféré par Justinien à Hārith? Nous ne pouvons traduire que par 'royauté,' mais en ajoutant immédiatement que dans les documents quasi officiels restés à notre disposition, le patriciat et la phylarchie sont seuls mentionnés": *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche*, 277f. This is almost the explanation E. Stein gave to the investiture of Arethas. He drops the story of the royal rank and speaks of the subordination of the Arab tribes under the Ghassânid: "titular kam dies dadurch zum Ausdruck, dass Charet den Patriziat erhielt": *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Reiches* (Stuttgart, 1919), 40.

¹¹⁷ I. Kavar, "Procopius on the Ghassânids," *JAOS*, 77 (1957), 79–87, esp. 84f.; *idem*, "Procopius and Arethas," esp. 366–69; *idem*, "The Patriciate of Arethas," *BZ*, 52 (1959), 321–43, *passim*; *idem*, "Procopius and Arethas Again," *Byzantion*, 41 (1971), 313–38, esp. 315–16.

¹¹⁸ He refers for this to the single example of the king of Palmyra, Odenathus. On Odenathus' title, see *infra*, pp. 51–52.

because with this statement he exercised his famous *Kaiserkritik*: his purpose was to show that the emperor's decision was fatal, since Arethas turned out to be a traitor.¹¹⁹

B. Rubin, the only scholar who has made use of the material collected by O. F. Winter on the *Roman* tradition of appointing kings,¹²⁰ does not hesitate to accept Procopius' information.¹²¹ He even understands it in terms of the Roman tradition of the *appellatio regis* and does not bother about the lack of evidence for this title of Arethas on the ground that Procopius uses in the same connection the same title for the "Persian"-Arab phylarch of Hira al-Moundhir.¹²² As a matter of fact, Procopius states explicitly that Arethas was made super-chief of a number of tribes, an "ἀρχιφύλαρχος" of the "Roman" Arabs, in order to face the super-chief of the "Persian" Arabs, Lahmid Moundhir, who βασιλέως ἀξίωμα ἔχων ἀπάντων μόνος τῶν ἐν Πέρσαις Σαρακηνῶν ἦρχε.¹²³ It is clear, therefore, that the ἀξίωμα βασιλέως of Arethas was meant to confront the βασιλέως ἀξίωμα of Moundhir. Thus, if we want to understand the royal dignity of Arethas, as Procopius wants us to, we have to see the "constitutional" position of the Lahmid phylarch, on the other side of the *limes*, in his relation to the Persian Great King.

Except Procopius, who twice calls Moundhir βασιλεύς,¹²⁴ Theophanes, Evagrius, and Menander call him φύλαρχος; once each, Theophanes¹²⁵ and the *Martyrium Sancti Arethae* use the diminutive βασιλίσκος. Nevertheless, the Syrian and the Arab sources use *malik* as the title of the Lahmid phylarchs, and there is no doubt that these "kings" were in fact part of the large community of kings functioning under the "king of kings" of Iran and Non-Iran, the Persian *shahanshah*. As A. Christensen defines their role: "Les membres de la première classe dans l'État sassanide portaient le titre de rois, ce qui justifiait le titre officiel du roi d'Iran, celui de 'Roi des Rois.' Cette classe comprenait d'abord les princes vassaux qui régnaient dans les extrémités de l'empire, les roitelets qui s'étaient mis sous la protection du roi d'Iran, et à qui le grand roi avait assuré, en revanche, la royauté pour eux et leurs successeurs, avec l'obligation de mettre leurs troupes à la disposition de leur suzerain et, peut-être, de payer un certain tribut. . . Parmi ces rois vassaux on comptait les rois arabes de Hira [*italics mine*]."¹²⁶ From this lesser position of king in relation to the Persian king of kings, Moundhir calls himself, according to Procopius, ὁ τῶν Σαρακηνῶν βασιλεύς, while for the Persian monarch he uses the vocative: ὦ βασιλέων βασιλεῦ.¹²⁷ On the other hand, this position is indicated when Theophanes and the *Martyrium S. Arethae* call him βασιλίσκος τῶν

¹¹⁹ Kawar, "Procopius and Arethas," 366–69. On the notorious treachery of Arethas, see V. Christides, "Saracens' *Prodosia* in Byzantine Sources," *Byzantion*, 40 (1970), 5–13. Cf. *infra*, note 140.

¹²⁰ On Winter's dissertation, see *infra*, note 166.

¹²¹ "Die Verleihung des Titels steht natürlich fest": Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 493 note 825.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 276.

¹²³ *Bella* I.18,45, 46.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.* I.17,30, I.18,45.

¹²⁵ Ed. de Boor, 178 line 9.

¹²⁶ A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd ed. (Copenhagen, 1944), 101.

¹²⁷ *Bella* I.17,30, 33.

Σαρακηνῶν, not in order to underrate his actual power, but to characterize his real legal position in relation to the Persian monarch, when he is called only βασιλεὺς τῶν Περσῶν. We can, therefore, assert that Moundhir was a *shah* in juxtaposition to the *shahanshah*, or a βασιλίσκος when the Persian monarch was called simply βασιλεὺς.¹²⁸

Are we justified, then, in classifying the appointment of Arethas, whatever Procopius wants us to understand, as an *appellatio regis*? Rubin, who recalls this Roman tradition, fails to distinguish between the appointment of a prince to an existing throne, on the one hand, and the designation of a chief as king of a kingdom that does not yet exist on the other.¹²⁹ If Arethas was really appointed king, then automatically the organization of his tribe must have been transformed into a kingdom, and there is no evidence to support such an explanation of what happened in or around 530 with the Roman Arabs. Justinian, according to Procopius, put all (or most) of the nomadic tribes under one phylarch, and it seems that for the first time on this occasion a united leadership, or an ἀρχιφυλαρχία, was established.¹³⁰ If the ἀρχιφυλαρχία was not established as a βασιλεία, and there is indeed no evidence to suggest it, then what remains, if we want to make use of Procopius' information, is that he either gave him the title of a king, without making him a real king, or he invested him with such honors and insignia that he could be regarded as the equal counterpart of King Moundhir.

The first possibility does not seem probable. In a relevant official document, Justinian's *Novel* 102 on the duties of the *moderator Arabiae* from the year 536, Arethas is referred to only with the title φύλαρχος, while there is no other evidence that he ever officially held the title βασιλεὺς.¹³¹ As a matter of fact, even Procopius, as R. Paret has already pointed out, does not suggest the conferment of the title but only of the royal dignity.¹³² We shall, therefore, have to content ourselves with the second choice, that Arethas was invested (περιθήμενος) with royal honors and insignia to be the counterpart of Moundhir.

¹²⁸ A. Vasiliev missed this point in thinking that "some Greek sources contemptuously call this man 'a little king of the Saracens,' but his contemporary Procopius highly praises his talents": *Justin the First*, 277.

¹²⁹ This distinction is necessary, however, for if Rome seems to have found content in the role of a king-maker we still have no reason to see her as a "kingdom"-maker. She has preserved some kingdoms for a while, when their incorporation into the provincial system did not seem or prove to be profitable, but she did not establish new kingdoms.

¹³⁰ Cf. Nöldeke, *Die Ghassānischen Fürsten*, 12; and G. Olinder, *The Kings of Kinda of the Family of Ākil al-Murār* (Lund-Leipzig, 1927), 66: "Before the year 529 there was probably no common ἀρχιφύλαρχος over the Arabs of the Romans."

¹³¹ Μήτε τῷ περιβλέπτῳ δουκὶ μήτε τῷ φυλάρχῳ μήτε τινὶ τῶν δυνατῶν οἰκῶν... *Novel* 102, chap. 1, ed. R. Schöll and G. Kroll (Berlin, 1929), 423 line 39. Kavar's supposition that in this passage there is a breviloquence (he reads τῷ περιβλέπτῳ δουκὶ... τῷ περιβλέπτῳ φυλάρχῳ) is very weak support for his artificial attempt to reconstruct Arethas' *cursus honorum* from the clarissimate (over the spectabilate and the illustre) to the gloriosissimate: "The Patriciate of Arethas" (note 117 *supra*), 323–29. Arethas was possibly *clarissimus* before 530, as the φύλαρχοι are called in Justinian's *Edict* IV (chap. 2: τοῖς περιβλέπτοις δουξὶ τοῖς λαμπροτάτοις φυλάρχοις; ed. Schöll and Kroll, 762 line 31), and he was *gloriosissimus* when he was made Roman *patricius*. But there is no reason to assume that at some time between 530 and 559 he received the other honors. As a matter of fact, he was made *patricius* (and *gloriosissimus*) as early as 530; see *infra*, p. 64.

¹³² "Ce qui strictement ne signifie pas la collation du titre de basileus": Paret, *op. cit.* (note 109 *supra*), 255.

Anyway, from the time of Arethas our sources record only that he was a *patricius*, and we shall have to examine the real meaning of his patriciate in comparison with the other national chiefs or rulers who held this title in the period under discussion.

From the time of Arethas' son and successor we hear about the crown of the "Roman" phylarchs. John of Biclar reports that when Moundhir visited Constantinople officially in 580 *cum stemmate suo Tiberio principi cum donis barbariae occurrit*.¹³³ We read about the size and value of the crown in the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus, who preserves important information on the Ghassânid's visit to the capital. According to John, "...he was received with great pomp, and endless honours conferred upon him by the merciful king Tiberius, who made him large presents and royal gifts, and did for him all that he desired, and gave him everything he asked, even bestowing military titles on the two sons, whom he had with him, *and giving him leave to wear a royal crown* [italics mine]."¹³⁴ John of Ephesus explains the issue on the permission "to wear a royal crown" in chap. IV.42: "...Tiberius dismissed him with great honours, and kingly presents of gold and silver, and magnificent dresses, and saddles, and bridles of gold, and armour. And besides all this, *he also gave him a royal crown* [italics mine], the right of wearing which had never hitherto been conceded to any of the chiefs of the Arabs, but only leave to put on their heads a simple circle."¹³⁵ From these two passages it is easy to put aside the oriental *topoi* and get the concrete information: the Ghassânid Moundhir, like all his predecessors, obviously including Arethas, had only the right to wear "a simple circlet," until in 580 Tiberius allowed him to wear "a royal crown." The "circlet," in Syriac *kelil*, is now identified with the *corona-aurea*, while the "royal crown," in Syriac *tağ*, is thought to be the proper *διάδημα*.¹³⁶ Ch. Clermont-Ganneau has noticed that the same word *tāghâ*, or *tāğ*, is used in the inscription of Nemâra for Imrou'l-Qais, the Persian vassal king "of all the Arabs" (dated to A.D. 328) and came to the conclusion: "Il est à présumer que c'est sur les sollicitations mêmes de Alamoundaros que Tibère se décida à lui conférer *cette distinction extraordinaire qui, aux yeux des Arabes, constituait la grande investiture royale à la mode perse* [italics mine]."¹³⁷ We shall have to conclude that when Arethas was made "βασιλεύς," he may have received with the rank of *patricius* only the royal-like "circlet," not the "crown."

In this connection we should examine the importance of the real royal crown presented to Arethas' son Moundhir for his "constitutional" position. Was it this time meant to be a conferment of a higher royal rank? If, on the grounds of Clermont-Ganneau's conclusion that it was an investiture *à la*

¹³³ MGH, *AA*, XI; in *Chronica minora*, ed. Mommsen (note 39 *supra*), II, 214 line 19, the chronology, "ca. 575," is wrong.

¹³⁴ *Ecclesiastical History* IV.39, trans. R. Payne Smith, *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus* (Oxford, 1860), 298.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 304-5.

¹³⁶ Nöldeke, *Die Ghassânischen Fürsten*, 25f.

¹³⁷ "Le *tâdj-dâr* Imrou'l-Qais et la royauté général des Arabes," *Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale*, 7 (1906), 167-70, esp. 169; cf. Paret, *op. cit.*, 257f.

mode perse, we examine the history of the "Persian" Arabs, the Lahmids, in the same period, we should take note of the information preserved in the Arabic chronicles of Agânî and Tabarî: on the occasion of the enthronement of the Lahmid King Nu'mân III, the Great King Hormizd IV presented him with a diadem (tâğ) which cost 6,000 Dirhen, and this event is echoed throughout Arabic poetry in the title "the crown holder"—*ḡû at-tâğ*, attributed to this king.¹³⁸ It is revealed how relevant this information is to our discussion when we recall that Nu'mân III succeeded his father Moundhir IV to the Lahmid leadership most probably in 580, i.e., the year of the Ghassânid Moundhir's visit to Constantinople.¹³⁹

We shall, therefore have to assume that in or about 580 the Persian monarch decided to emphasize the position of his vassal king among the Arabs and presented him with a "royal crown"; whereupon Tiberios either was asked to or thought it wise to react in a similar way, and offered to his vassal phylarch what his Arabs, who knew the Persian ceremonies, would recognize as a royal crown.

For the purposes of this study the conclusion should suffice that the title *basileus* was not conceded to the Arab phylarchs, nor was it assumed by them, although their title in Arabic was *malik* (king).

EXCURSUS

THE TITLES OF ODENATHUS OF PALMYRA

I. Kavar-Shahid asserts that before the Ghassânid Arethas another Saracen, King Odenathus of Palmyra, was conferred the title βασιλεύς, because he was officially nominated "king of kings."¹⁴⁰ However, there is no evidence whatsoever that Odenathus was actually recognized as "king of kings" by the Roman emperor. According to the sources he became tyrant of his native city of Palmyra, which, in the middle of the third century, was not only the most important trade and communication center of eastern Syria but also the only serious military power for protecting trade activities and caravans and for defending the Euphrates border.¹⁴¹ During the Roman-Persian war, Emperor Gallienus authorized Odenathus to command the Roman troops of the East and gave him the military title of *dux Romanorum*, and later *corrector*

¹³⁸ Cf. G. Rothstein, *Die Dynastie der Lahmiden in al-Hira. Ein Versuch zur arabisch-persischen Geschichte zur Zeit der Sasaniden* (Berlin, 1899), 128f.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 111. This connection of Moundhir's permission to carry a royal crown with the "coronation" of his counterpart Nu'mân in the same year has not been pointed out before, although Rothstein, *ibid.*, 129, mentions the evidence in John of Ephesos for the Ghassanid's title as cited by Nöldeke.

¹⁴⁰ "Arethas Son of Jabalah," *JAOS*, 75 (1955), 212f.: "The Romans had conferred the title not only of king but also 'king of kings' on one of Arethas' predecessors in the service of Rome, namely Odenathus, of whom Procopius certainly knew"; see further *idem*, "Procopius and Arethas" (note 117 *supra*), 367; *idem*, "Procopius and Arethas Again" (note 117 *supra*), 316, answering Christides, who regards the reference to Odenathus as not wrong but "irrelevant, since for Procopius the activities of Odenathus take place in the remote past": *op. cit.* (note 119 *supra*), 6 note 1. Rubin accepts Kavar's reference to Odenathus: *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 495 note 830.

¹⁴¹ Jones, *op. cit.* (note 104 *supra*), 265f.

totius Orientis.¹⁴² This strong position of Odenathus is described by the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*: *Odenathus rex Palmyrenorum optinuit totius Orientis imperium*.¹⁴³ This description defines the actual position of Odenathus in A.D. 264,¹⁴⁴ but is nevertheless erroneous, if the term *imperium* is used in the technical sense of "being *imperator*," i.e., of assuming the imperial power.¹⁴⁵

The assertion that Odenathus was conferred the title "king of kings" is probably made on the ground of a Palmyrenian bilingual *miliarium*¹⁴⁶ from the time of Odenathus' son and successor Vaballathus Athenodorus (A.D. 268–70), i.e., from the period after Odenathus' death, during which his famous wife Zenobia, being the actual ruler of Palmyra, initiated an independent imperial policy, usurped the title *augusta* for herself, and occupied such imperial lands as Syria and Egypt.¹⁴⁷ According to the Palmyrenian version of the inscription, Athenodorus and Odenathus hold the title "king of kings." This title for father and son is, no doubt, an understandable novelty for a period of war with the Persian monarch, the "king of kings of Iran and Non-Iran," but there is no evidence to prove that it was conferred by Rome or assumed on Roman approval and recognition. For Rome conferred no titles to Odenathus and his son short of the Roman military ones.

IV. THE KINGDOMS OF THE *VÖLKERWANDERUNG*

1. *The Germanic Kingdoms*

The Germanic nations of the *Völkerwanderung* established themselves in the course of the fourth to the sixth century on the soil of the former Roman provinces. In their individual development they underwent quite a variety of constitutional forms, all of which resulted in monarchical leadership. This leadership was called by the Latin term *regnum* and in every case the ruler's official title was *rex*. So it was with the Visigoths,¹⁴⁸ the Ostro-

¹⁴² Cf. Ch. Clermont-Ganneau, "Odeinat et Vaballat rois de Palmyre, et leur titre romain de *corrector*," *RBibl*, 29 (1920), 394. ¹⁴³ *Vita Gallieni* 10.1, ed. E. Hohl (Berlin, 1971), II, 88 line 16.

¹⁴⁴ Ziegler, *op. cit.* (note 25 *supra*), 144.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. *Vita Gallieni* 3.3: *Totius prope igitur Orientis factus est Odenatus imperator*; cf. also *Tyranni Triginta* 15.1–8, ed. Hohl, II, 115.20–116.23. Cf. J. G. Février, *Essai sur l'histoire politique et économique de Palmyre* (Paris, 1931), 72ff.

¹⁴⁶ *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* II, no. 3271. The Palmyrenian version reads in Latin translation: *Pro salute et [victoria] Septimii Vahballathi Athenodori, illustrissimi regis regum et correctoris totius Orientis, filii Septimii [Odaenathi regis] regum; et pro salute Septimiae Batzabbai, illustrissimae reginae, matris regis regum filiae Antiochi*. The proposed restitution of the destroyed Greek version is: [Ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ νείκης Ἰουλίου Αὐρηλίου Σεπτιμίου Οὐαβαλλάθου Ἀθηνοδώρου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου βασιλέως καὶ ἑπανορθωτοῦ πάσης ἑπαρχίας κ]α[ὶ ὑπὲρ σω]τηρίας Σεπτιμίας Ζηνοβίας τῆς λαμπροτάτης βασιλίσσης μητρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως. . .; cf. Clermont-Ganneau, "Odeinat et Vaballat," 394f.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. A. Alföldi, "The Crisis of the Empire (A.D. 249–270)," *CAH*, XII (1939; repr. 1961), 174–80.

¹⁴⁸ On the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse, see L. Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen* (Munich, 1941; repr. 1969) (hereafter Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*), 510. On the kingdom of Toledo, see E. A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain* (Oxford, 1969), 252f.; and K. F. Stroheker, "Das spanische Westgotenreich und Byzanz," *BJb*, 163 (1963), 252–74, esp. 264f., repr. in *idem*, *Germanentum und Spätantike* (Zürich-Stuttgart, 1965), 228f. On the early underdeveloped kingdom in the fourth century, see Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*, 243f.; and E. A. Thompson, *The Visigoths in the Time of Ulfila* (Oxford, 1966), 43–55. On the early Germanic kingship, see J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, "Germanic Kingship and the Romans," in *idem*, *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent* (Oxford, 1971), 1–20. On the problem of the titles of the barbarian rulers, see H. Wolfram, *Intitulatio I. Lateinische Königs- und Fürstentitel bis zum Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts*, *MittIOG*, Suppl. 21 (1967).

goths,¹⁴⁹ the Vandals,¹⁵⁰ the Burgundians,¹⁵¹ the Franks,¹⁵² and the Lombards.¹⁵³

The royal chanceries applied further additional titles for their rulers; the kings of the Visigoths, the Vandals, the Burgundians, and the Franks received the titles *dominus* or *dominus noster*,¹⁵⁴ or even the title *princeps*. Nevertheless, before A.D. 800 none of the Germanic kings ever assumed the official titles of the Roman emperor, i.e., *imperator*¹⁵⁵ and *Augustus*.¹⁵⁶

As an exception, one which has been taken very seriously by many scholars,¹⁵⁷ we shall have to examine the fact that on coins struck by the Frankish King Theodebert I (534–48) we find on the reverse *Victoria Augusti* (or *Augustorum*), and on the obverse of a single coin the titles *pp. Aug.* On this issue I am very pleased to incorporate verbatim a note written by Professor Philip Grierson at my request:

The vast bulk of the pseudo-imperial coinage struck by the Germanic peoples and their rulers in the fifth to seventh centuries has copied mechanically the *Victoria Aug.* and *Victoria Augustorum* formulae of the originals, and often retain these after they have begun to place their own names on the obverses of the coins, but they never use the title of *Augustus* themselves with such epithets as *rex*, *victor*, and *DN* (for *dominus noster*) and so forth. The one apparent exception to this rule is a solidus of the Frankish king Theodebert I with an inscription DN THEIDEB ERTIPPAUC, and the authenticity of this cannot be regarded as assured. Only a single specimen is known, formerly in the Voillemier Collection, and now in Berlin.¹⁵⁸ The style of the obverse bust and the standing angel on the reverse correspond

¹⁴⁹ *Rex Gothorum*: cf. the index to Cassiodorus's *Variae*, ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH, *AA*, XII (Berlin, 1894), s.v. *rex*. On the titles of the Ostrogothic kings of Italy, see Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*, 360f., 371f.

¹⁵⁰ *Rex Wandalorum et Alanorum*: L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Wandalen* (Munich, 1942), 148f., 156f.

¹⁵¹ *Rex Burgundionum*: *idem*, *Die Ostgermanen*, 176. For the period of the underdeveloped kingship (the phylarchs), see *ibid.*, 167f.

¹⁵² *Rex Francorum*: E. Zöllner, *Geschichte der Franken bis zur Mitte des sechsten Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1970), 120. For the later period, see B. Krusch, *Studien zur fränkischen Diplomatie. Der Titel der fränkischen Könige*, AbhBerl, Phil.-hist.Kl., 1937 no. 1 (Berlin, 1937).

¹⁵³ *Rex Langobardorum*: Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*, 616.

¹⁵⁴ See the evidence in the works mentioned *supra*, notes 148–53. The obvious fact that this title is borrowed from the Roman emperors does not mean that it characterizes the sovereignty of the ruler in his relationship to the Roman emperor, as Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*, 510 note 3, suggests, but merely the absolute form of rule in the relation of the monarch to his subjects. Even the nonreigning members of the Burgundian royal family are addressed with the title *dominus*; cf. *ibid.*, 172.

¹⁵⁵ Only the Maurish kinglet Masties (ca. 535) was not contented with his Roman title *dux* and added to his name the title *imperator* (!); cf. Ch. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris, 1955), 333 and Appendix II note 132.

¹⁵⁶ Unique is the private inscription set up by the Roman senator Caecina Mavortius Basilius Decius, who styled the Ostrogothic King Theoderic *rex Theodericus victor ac triumphator semper Augustus*: H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, I (Berlin, 1892), no. 827. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill's conclusion from this inscription is erroneous: "Imperial practice in the bestowal of titles of honour on barbarian rulers seems not to have been governed by hard and fast rules, and it is hardly surprising that western commentators sometimes gave misleading accounts, particularly of insignia": *The Long-Haired Kings and Other Studies in Frankish History* (London, 1962), 175 note 4. Just the opposite is true.

¹⁵⁷ See, e.g., Bréhier, *Les institutions* (note 3 *supra*), 294: "L'effigie impériale figurait parfois sur les monnaies, frappées au poids et au titre légal de l'Empire: la disparition de cette effigie indiquait l'émancipation d'un vassal. Exemple du Mérovingien Théodebert, fils de Clovis." Cf. A. Gasquet, *L'empire byzantin et la monarchie franque* (Paris, 1888), 171–78; Zöllner, *op. cit.*, 122f.

¹⁵⁸ A. de Belfort, *Description générale des monnaies mérovingiennes*, IV (Paris, 1894), no. 5467, citing Dr. Voillemier, "Des premières monnoies d'or mérovingiennes, et spécialement de quelques-unes de Théodebert I^{er}," *RN* (1841), 119–20, no. 7, pl. iv, 7. The coin was then in his collection. For a photograph, see A. Suhle, *Deutsche Münz- und Geldgeschichte von den Anfängen bis zum 15. Jahrhundert*, 3rd ed. (Munich, 1964), 17.

closely to one of the Italian issues of Justinian's reign, and the coin is what we could expect of an Italian issue of Theodebert. But the weight (4.14 g.) is abnormally low. Theodebert's coins regularly spell him Theodibertus, with an "o" and in the nominative,¹⁵⁹ and not Theudeberti with a "u" and in the genitive, and the normal title on the coins is *rex* or *victor*, not *augustus*. Although the coin was published as long ago as 1841, the forging of Merovingian coins had begun as early as the seventeenth century, and in my view the coin is too doubtful for any weight to be attached to it.

If Theodebert's coin is a forgery, and therefore is not to be considered, we can conclude that there is no exception to the rule that the Germanic kings never used the imperial titles. There should be no doubt that the barbarian rulers avoided the titles of the Roman emperor not because it would be an unwelcome innovation to their national traditions, but mainly because they recognized the sovereignty of the Roman state over the territory of their establishment. This was the legal reality which they agreed to share by virtue of the *foedus* they concluded with the Empire. This reality was respected even in times when, due to the current constellation of power, it appeared to be more a fiction than to possess any political validity.

The usage of titles in the royal chanceries is imitated by the Latin literary sources of this time. The papal chancery, the Acts of the western synods, Cassiodorus, Jordanes, Ennodius, *Excerpta Valesiana*, and the *Liber Pontificalis*, to mention the most important sources, call the Germanic kings *reges* and preserve the title *imperator* only for the Byzantine emperor.¹⁶⁰ As late as 799 Alcuin praised Charlemagne in regarding his *regalis dignitas* as being third after the pope's *apostolica sublimitas* and the Roman emperor's *imperialis dignitas*.¹⁶¹

On the other hand, the evidence introduced by Helm shows in fact that the majority of Greek literary sources mention the Germanic kings in several cases with the title βασιλεύς.¹⁶² It is worth mentioning, however, that, as Vetter points out, according to Malalas all the western kings (the Germans and the Huns) are only ῥῆγες,¹⁶³ although he does not hesitate, of course, to call the western emperors βασιλεῖς. Moreover, a historian like Olympiodorus, who had served several times as ambassador to the court of barbaric monarchs, calls them ῥῆγες or φύλαρχοι, but never βασιλεῖς, a title that he attributes only to the Roman emperor.¹⁶⁴ Letters of Roman emperors addressed to Germanic

¹⁵⁹ See the index in de Belfort, *op. cit.*, V (1895), 121–22. The triens which he cites as no. 5488 with Theudbertus is misread; see M. Prou, *Les monnaies mérovingiennes* (Paris, 1892), no. 43. The spelling Thuodibertus, *ibid.*, no. 53, is irregular.

¹⁶⁰ See the list made by G. Vetter, *Die Ostgoten und Theoderich* (Stuttgart, 1938), 109, at note 128. For the Latin sources of the Germanic states, see F. Haenssler, *Byzanz und Byzantiner. Ihr Bild im Spiegel der Überlieferung der germanischen Reiche im früheren Mittelalter* (Bern, 1960).

¹⁶¹ Alcuini, *Ep. ad Carolum*, ed. E. Dümmmler, MGH, *Ep.*, IV (Berlin, 1895), 288 line 17 ff.: *Nam tres personae in mundo altissime fuerunt: id est apostolica sublimitas. Alia est imperialis dignitas. Tertia est regalis dignitas.*

¹⁶² *Op. cit.* (note 13 *supra*), 383 note 2. Cf. also the material collected by Vetter, *op. cit.*, 110, at note 133, for the use of βασιλεύς and ῥῆξ in Malchus, Eustathius, Procopius, Malalas, and Theophanes.

¹⁶³ Vetter, *op. cit.*, 54. Cf. W. Ennsin, in *BZ*, 40 (1940), 173.

¹⁶⁴ *FHG*, IV, 57–68. On Vetter's argumentation on the fact that Procopius avoids the term ῥῆξ (except in special cases: see *infra*, pp. 56–57) and calls all monarchs βασιλεῖς, see the answer of Ennsin, *op. cit.*, 173: "Prokop als Purist vermeidet es möglichst nichtgriechische Wörter zu gebrauchen."

rulers are not preserved in Greek.¹⁶⁵ However, the *deperdita* found in literary sources testify, as far as I can see, to the statement that the Roman court never used the title βασιλεύς in connection with any Germanic king.¹⁶⁶ There is one exception: Procopius quotes from two letters written by Justinian to Gelimer, who in 530 overthrew the Vandal king Ilderic and became himself *rex Vandalarum*. In these letters, Justinian calls Ilderic βασιλέα Βανδάλων, and the Vandal monarchy βασιλεία.¹⁶⁷ However, the explanation is to be found, in my opinion, in the fact that these two letters were written originally in Latin, and the “purist” Procopius contented himself with translating the terms *rex* and *regnum* of the original into βασιλεύς and βασιλεία.¹⁶⁸

As exceptional evidence I shall have to mention the famous passage in Gregory of Tours’ *Histories* on the investiture of the Frankish king Clovis as *ex consule* through the ambassadors of Emperor Anastasius in 508, which ends with the information that “from this day on he was called ‘consul or augustus’”: *Igitur ab Anastasio imperatore codecillos de consulato accepit et in basilica beati Martini tunica blathea indutus at clamide, imponens vertice diademam. Tunc ascenso equite, aurum argentumque in itinere illo, quod inter portam atrii et ecclesiam civitatis est, praesentibus populis manu propria spargens... ab ea die tamquam consul aut augustus est vocitatus.*¹⁶⁹ During the lively discussion on the meaning of this passage, which reached its climax in the years after 1933 when B. Krush understood it to testify to the first imperial coronation

¹⁶⁵ For the period up to 476, see O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr.* (Stuttgart, 1919; repr. Frankfurt, 1964). For the period after 565, see F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, I (Munich, 1924). I am preparing a *Regesten* volume covering the period between 476 and 565. In a single case, in the inscription of the letter of Maurice to Childebert preserved in Latin (*ibid.*, 83) the Frankish king is called *Childeberthus vir gloriosus rex Francorum*: MGH, *Ep.*, III (Berlin, 1892), no. 42, p. 148 line 24.

¹⁶⁶ This observation is backed by the results of Winter, *op. cit.* (note 37 *supra*), 35–50, esp. 42, namely that the Roman policy of *reges appellare* was not adapted to the Germanic rulers. Cf. *idem*, *Antike Königserhebungen und ihre Weiterbildung durch das byzantinische Kaisertum* (Diss. University of Vienna, 1941 [unpub.]), summarized in Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustiniens*, 493–95.

¹⁶⁷ *Bella* III.9, 10–19: Οὐχ ὅσα ποιεῖς οὐδὲ τῶν Γελερῖχου διαθηκῶν ἄξια, γέροντά τε καὶ συγγενῆ καὶ βασιλέα Βανδάλων... μήτε οὖν ἐργάσῃ περαιτέρω κακὸν μήτε τοῦ βασιλέως ὀνόματος ἀνταλλάξῃ τὴν τοῦ τυράννου προσήγορίαν, βραχεὶ προτερεύουσιν χρόνῳ ἀλλὰ τοῦτον μὲν, ἄνδρα ὅσον οὕτω τεθνηζόμενον, ἔα φέρεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τὴν τῆς βασιλείας εἰκόνα, σὺ δὲ ἅπαντα πράττει ὅσα βασιλέα πράττειν εἰκός.

¹⁶⁸ If he had preferred to transcribe *rex* as ῥήξ he would have had difficulties translating *regnum* to an adequate Greek word, different from βασιλεία. This is the way H. B. Dewing understood the meaning of Procopius’ quotation. In his English translation the βασιλεύς Βανδάλων is “king of the Vandals,” the εἰκὼν τῆς βασιλείας is “form of royal power,” while the βασιλεία Ἰουστινιανοῦ is rightly Justinian’s “imperial power”: Procopius, Loeb, II (London-New York, 1916), 87. On the method used by Procopius in incorporating letters into his *Histories*, see F. Dahn, *Prokopius von Cäsarea* (Berlin, 1865), 89–104, esp. 93f. On the authentic letters quoted by Procopius (among them are the two letters under discussion), O. Veh comments: “Indessen tragen auch sie [the authentic letters] in ihrer Schlichte nicht das rhetorische Gewand der byzantinischen Kanzlei, sondern die Ausdrucksweise Prokops, der vielleicht manches Dokument wie z.B. die zwischen dem ostgotischen bzw. vandalischen Höfen und Byzanz gewechselten Briefe aus dem Lateinischen erst übertragen musste”: *Zur Geschichtsschreibung und Weltanschauung des Prokop von Cäsarea*, I, Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht 1950/51 des Gymnasiums Bayreuth (Bayreuth, 1951), 16. That in Greek Geiseric’s title was ῥήξ we see in Theophanes: ῥήγα καλέσας ἑαυτὸν γῆς τε καὶ θαλάσσης: ed. de Boor, 101 line 19. On the *superscriptio* of Gelimer’s letter to Justinian (Βασιλεύς Γερίμερ Ἰουστινιανῷ βασιλεῖ: Procopius, *Bella* III.10, 20), see Wolfgram, *op. cit.* (note 148 *supra*), 134f.

¹⁶⁹ *Historiarum* II.38, ed. B. Krusch, MGH, *Scripta Rer Merov.*, I, 1,1 (Hannover, 1936), 88 line 15–89 line 5.

of a German king,¹⁷⁰ K. Hauck reached the most satisfactory interpretation in translating the verb *vocitare* with *acclamare*, and so translating the passage “from this day on he was acclamated (*voces* = *acclamationes*) as a consul of the emperor.”¹⁷¹

Since this passage is by no means to be taken anymore as referring to an imperial title *augustus*, there is for our discussion no need to look for any further explanation.¹⁷² Nevertheless, in my opinion it could be fruitful to reconsider the evidence for the possible patriciate of Clovis combined with royal (not consular) acclamations and *donativa* in the sense of an *ingressus regis*, and to reexamine the possibility that Gregory of Tours a) relies for this passage on *topoi*,¹⁷³ and b) absorbs the aspirations of the clergy of Tours, as Courcelle anticipated.¹⁷⁴

It can be stated, therefore, that the imperial titles *imperator* and *augustus* were never usurped by the Germanic kings.

Finally, we have to examine two cases in which Procopius uses the term ῥήξ. The first is the story of the Heruls who assassinated their king because they decided to live without one.¹⁷⁵ If the purist Procopius uses ῥήξ this time, there is possibly no other reason than his intention to emphasize the weak

¹⁷⁰ *Die erste deutsche Kaiserkrönung in Tours, Weihnachten 508*, SBBerl, Phil.-hist.Kl., 1933 (Berlin, 1933), 1060ff. H. Günther disagreed, in “Der Patriziat Chlodwigs,” *HJ*, 54 (1934), 468–75. Günther’s suggestion that in 508 Clovis was designated Roman *patricius* was rejected by L. Schmidt, “Nochmals der Patriziat Chlodwechs,” *HJ*, 55 (1935), 552f.; while W. Ennslin, “Nochmals zu der Ehrung Chlodwechs,” *HJ*, 56 (1936), 499–507, esp. 507, conjectured the expression *aut augustus* into *ut augustus*, with the meaning “he was called consul like the Emperor.” Cf. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Long-Haired Kings* (note 156 *supra*), 175 note 1; and the German translation of Gregory of Tours by R. Buchner, *Zehn Bücher Geschichten*, I (Darmstadt, 1970), 134: “Von diesem Tag an wurde er wie der Kaiser [italics mine] konsul genannt.”

¹⁷¹ “Von einer spätantiken Randkultur zum karolingischen Europa,” *Frühmittelalterliche Studien. Jahrbuch des Instituts für Frühmittelalterforschung der Universität Münster*, 1 (1967), 1–93, esp. 30ff. This explanation is anticipated by P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques* (Paris, 1948), 203: “Il est exclu que l’empereur ait accordé à Clovis une investiture quelconque; le proclamer auguste, c’aurait été le désigner comme collègue à l’empire! Si les lignes ont un sens et correspondent à des faits, Clovis, à la suite de cette cérémonie, a été acclamé ‘auguste’ par le peuple.” Cf. the extensive discussion of this subject, *ibid.*, 4th ed. (Paris, 1964), 242–50.

¹⁷² Mr. Grierson has called attention to the difficulty created by one of Gregory’s incidental touches, the assertion that Clovis, on the occasion of his consular procession, threw gold and silver coins to the people, for at that time there were no silver coins regularly circulating in the West. In the late fifth and early sixth centuries the Franks did indeed sometimes strike minuscule silver coins (cf. Prou, *op. cit.* [note 159 *supra*], xcvi; J. Lafaurie, “Monnaie en argent trouvé à Fleury-sur-Orne. Essai sur le monnayage d’argent franc des V^e et VI^e siècles,” *Annales de Normandie*, 14 [1964], 173–222), but they were too tiny to be suitable for distribution in this fashion, and although the contents of Childric’s tomb show that earlier Roman silver coins, presumably from recently discovered hoards, were much prized, they would scarcely have been numerous enough to serve as *Auswurfsmünzen*; cf. R. MacMullen, “The Emperor’s Largesses,” *Latomus*, 21 (1962), 159–66; and, in the specific consular context, H. Stern, *Le Calendrier de 354. Etude sur son texte et ses illustrations* (Paris, 1953), 152f. and pl. xiv. For a general survey, cf. N. L. Rasmussen, “Auswurfsmünzen,” *Atti del Congresso internazionale di numismatica, Roma 1961*, II (Rome, 1965), 623–36, Clovis at p. 625.

¹⁷³ For the *topoi* in the description of the *pompae* of the Emperors Gallienus and Aurelianus by the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, see E. Merten, *Zwei Herrscherfeste in der Historia Augusta, Untersuchungen zu den pompae der Kaiser Gallienus und Aurelianus* (Bonn, 1968).

¹⁷⁴ *Op. cit.*, 204.

¹⁷⁵ “Ἐρουλοὶ τὸ τοῦ τρόπου θηριῶδες τε καὶ μανιῶδες ἐνδειξάμενοι ἐς τὸν αὐτῶν ῥήγα (ἦν δὲ οὗτος ἀνὴρ Ὀχος ὄνομα) ἑξαπιναιῶς τὸν ἀνδρωπὸν ἀπ’ οὐδεμιᾶς αἰτίας ἔκτειναν, ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἐπενεγκόντες ἢ ὅτι ἀβασίλευντο τὸ λοιπὸν βούλονται εἶναι. καίτοι καὶ πρότερον ὄνομα μὲν αὐτοῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶχεν, ἰδιώτου δὲ ὄνομα οὐδὲν τι σχεδὸν ἐφέρετο πλέον: *Bella* VI.14,38–39, ed. Haury and Wirth, II (1963), 214 lines 4–11.

position of the kingly, who had the title of king but in fact did not differ from the common men.¹⁷⁶ Later the Heruls changed their minds, and after some unsuccessful attempts to get a king from their native country in Scandinavia they asked the Emperor Justinian to choose and send one. Procopius, who tells the story, avoids again the use of βασιλεύς, except for the emperor, and calls the king to be elected an ἄρχων.¹⁷⁷

In the second case, the purist Procopius uses the term ῥήξ when he defines Theoderic's rule in Italy: Καὶ βασιλέως μὲν τοῦ Ῥωμαίων οὔτε τοῦ σχήματος οὔτε τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐπιβατεῦσαι ἠξίωσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥήξ διεβίου καλούμενος (οὕτω γὰρ σφῶν τοῦς ἡγεμόνας καλεῖν οἱ βάρβαροι νενομίκασι) τῶν μέντοι κατηκόων τῶν αὐτοῦ προὔστη ξύμπαντα περιβαλλόμενος ὅσα τῷ φύσει βασιλεῖ ἤρμοσται.¹⁷⁸

This is not the proper place to study this significant passage for Theoderic's "constitutional" position, as it was understood in Constantinople. Nevertheless, we must examine the distinction between the terms ῥήξ and βασιλεύς.¹⁷⁹

Although Procopius' determinative expression βασιλέως τοῦ Ῥωμαίων leaves room for other βασιλεῖς, who could be not Roman, it is obvious that the φύσει βασιλεύς to whom Theoderic is compared is not a "king," but the emperor.¹⁸⁰ The ὄνομα βασιλέως, which Theoderic did not usurp, is, therefore, not only *imperator* in Latin, but also that same title βασιλεύς in Greek.¹⁸¹

A few lines further on, Procopius gives a remarkable definition of Theoderic's position: Ἦν τε ὁ Θεωδέριχος λόγῳ μὲν τύραννος, ἔργῳ δὲ βασιλεύς ἀληθῆς τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ τιμῇ τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εὐδοκιμηκότων οὐδενὸς ἦσσαν.¹⁸²

Again, the comparison of the βασιλεύς to those "who have distinguished themselves in this office from the beginning" shows that the moral and political image of the true ruler, which Procopius attributes to Theoderic, is not that of a "king," but that of the Roman emperor.¹⁸³ In this final evaluation of Theoderic's character and rule the historian thinks it necessary to state that his favorite ruler λόγῳ was not a βασιλεύς, i.e., he did not have the title nor the legal status of a βασιλεύς.

¹⁷⁶ On the Herulian kingship, see Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen*, 554.

¹⁷⁷ Πέμπαντες οὖν ἐς Βυζάντιον βασιλέως ἐδέοντο ἄρχοντα σφίσι πέμπειν, ὃν ἂν αὐτῷ βουλευόμενῳ εἴη: *Bella* VI.15,31; cf. also VI.15,36: καὶ βασιλεύς [i.e., 'Ιουστινιανὸς] πάσῃ δυνάμει κατάγων ἐς τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτὸν ἐν σπουδῇ ἐποιεῖτο.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.* V.1,26, ed. Haury and Wirth, II, 8 line 8.

¹⁷⁹ I am preparing a study on "Theodericus rex: Τύραννος or βασιλεύς?"

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Dewing's translation: "And though he did not claim the right to assume either the garb or the name of emperor of the Romans, but was called 'rex' to the end of his life (for thus the barbarians are accustomed to call their leaders), still, in governing his own subjects, he invested himself with all the qualities which appropriately belong to one who is *by birth an emperor* [italics mine]," and his footnote: "the title 'rex' was current among the barbarians to indicate a position inferior to that of a βασιλεύς or 'imperator'": *op. cit.*, III, 11 and note 2.

¹⁸¹ Procopius does not know of any exclusive imperial titles in Greek. He uses the equivalent of *imperator*, αὐτοκράτωρ, in its old Greek meaning; e.g., *Bella* V.5,4: στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ ἐφ' ὅπασι Βελισάριος ἦν. See the index of the edition of Haury and Wirth, IV (1964), 342 s.v.

¹⁸² *Bella* VI.29. On Procopius' classical models, see Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 436 note 486, 495 note 850.

¹⁸³ The reason Procopius gives for his positive picture of Theoderic, namely his care for his subjects, Goths and Italians, and their unanimous love for him (VI.29–31), is well explained in terms of the *Kaiserkritik*, as F. Dahn (*op. cit.* [note 168 *supra*]) and B. Rubin (in *RE*, 23,1 [1957], col. 429) have pointed out. This shows again that Procopius' *Fürstenspiegel* is that of the "true emperor."

2. Attila and the Hunnic "Kingdoms"

Attila is mentioned by R. Helm as the first example of those rulers of national "kingdoms" who are referred to in the Greek sources with the title βασιλεύς.¹⁸⁴ However, the evidence supplied by Priscus Panites, the most reliable source for the history of Attila and his Huns, proves that in spite of the current use of this term the historians were conscious of its function as the official and exclusive title of the Roman emperor.

Priscus does not hesitate to use the title, not only for Attila but even for the chiefs of the Hunnic tribes united under his authority.¹⁸⁵ On the other hand, the same historian provides us with positive evidence that Attila, whatever he was called in the literature, even by Priscus himself, was not officially conceded the title *basileus*. He reports a conversation that took place in 449 at the court of Attila among the Roman ambassadors, who were waiting to be received for an audience with the king. During their conversation about whether it would be wise to try to direct the greediness of the Huns toward Persia, in the hope of rescuing the Empire from their excessive demands, Comentiolos, a Roman native of Pannonia, expressed his fear that if Attila should succeed in subduing the Persians he would demand much more. Thus, he would not tolerate being deprived of his proper rank and would no more be satisfied with the title of a Roman *magister militum* (a fiction used by the imperial government to cover the annual tribute paid to him as his salary for his service as general) and would force the Empire to render him the title βασιλεύς!¹⁸⁶

There should be no doubt that Attila, even at the zenith of his power, had to accept the fact that the Romans were "depriving" him of his dignity as βασιλεύς.¹⁸⁷

In a previous chapter we have seen how the Hunnic rulers of the Black Sea were bestowed with great honors and titles of high Byzantine rank, as recogni-

¹⁸⁴ *Op. cit.* (note 13 *supra*), 383 note 2.

¹⁸⁵ Speaking of the gifts which the Emperor Theodosius II sent to the chiefs he speaks of τῶν βασιλέων τοῦ ξθνους, who are συμβασιλεύοντες of Attila: *Exc. de leg.*, ed. C. de Boor (Berlin, 1903), p. 130 line 13ff. Cf. Altheim, *Geschichte der Hunnen* (note 91 *supra*), IV, 275. Altheim's interpretation of συμβασιλεύοντες is erroneous: Priscus' ἐκάστῳ should not be read as ἐκατέρῳ. Cf. *cuiusque gentis regis*, in the Latin translation of C. Cantoclarus, in *FHG*, IV, 82f.

¹⁸⁶ Οὐκ ἔτι Ῥωμαίων ἀνέξεσθαι τὴν αὐτοῦ νοσφιζομένην ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ θεράποντας περιφανῶς ἡγησάμενον χαλεπώτερα ἐπιτάξεων καὶ οὐκ ἀνεκτὰ ἐκείνοις ἐπιτάγματα, ἣν δ' <ἡ> ἀξία, ἣς ὁ Κωνσταντίος ἐπεμνήσθη, στρατηγοῦ Ῥωμαίων, ἣς χάριν ὁ Ἀττίλας παρὰ βασιλέως ἐδέδεκτο τὸ τοῦ φόρου ἐπικαλύπτοντος ὄνομα, ὥστε αὐτῷ σιτηρεσίου προφάσει τοῦ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς χορηγουμένου καὶ συντάξεις ἐκπέμπεσθαι. ἔλεγεν οὖν μετὰ Μήδους καὶ Πάρσους καὶ Πέρσας τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα ὅπερ αὐτὸν βούλονται Ῥωμαῖοι καλεῖν, καὶ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἣ αὐτὸν τετιμηκέναι νομίζουσιν, ἀποσεισάμενον ἀναγκάσειν σφᾶς ἀντὶ στρατηγὸν βασιλέα προσαγορεύειν (*Exc. de leg.*, p. 142 lines 4–15). Priscus was an eyewitness, and therefore his trustworthiness is beyond any doubt.

¹⁸⁷ The meaning of this passage has been overestimated by E. A. Thompson, who interprets the statement of Comentiolos as follows: "If Persia were to collapse, the outlook for the Roman Empire would be very black, for he doubted if Attila would allow them to maintain an independent existence once Persia had fallen": *A History of Attila and the Huns* (Oxford, 1948), 115. On the question of Attila holding the office of στρατηγός (= *magister militum*), according to Priscus' evidence, see Seeck, *Geschichte* (note 41 *supra*), VI (1920), 290. Cf. Al. Demandt, in *RE*, suppl. 12 (1970), col. 753, *s.v. magister militum*. This question deserves further investigation in order to date Attila's "promotion" and to uncover the real reason for similar gestures of the Roman government toward other "barbarian" rulers before and after Attila.

tion of their loyal service to the Empire.¹⁸⁸ Nevertheless, they were not conceded the imperial title in Greek: βασιλεύς!

V. STATE SOVEREIGNTY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

A. Gasquet, Th. Nöldeke, and Th. Mommsen have long ago pointed out that when we study the titles of emperors and kings it is very important to examine separately the literary sources on the one hand, and the official imperial documents on the other.¹⁸⁹ This distinction has hitherto been made only when the imperial titles were studied, and it was upon this distinction that the title *basileus*, found in official use in 629, was considered significant, although in the literary sources the same title was unofficially used for the emperors as early as the first century B.C. However, this distinction has not been made in the study of the regnal titles of the rulers of countries neighboring Byzantium. As we can see now, it was in failing to do this that George Ostrogorsky came to the conclusion that the title *basileus* was used in Byzantium before Heraclius for foreign rulers. As a matter of fact, for most of these rulers we do find this title used by the Early Byzantine literary sources. Nonetheless, the study of all available documents issued from the imperial chancery in the period from Constantine the Great to Heraclius has shown that, with the exception of the Persian King of Kings, in no case was any foreign ruler ever officially conceded or acknowledged to hold legitimately the title *basileus*. This is true even for those Oriental kings subordinate to the emperor, whose elevation to their national throne was due to imperial recognition and investiture with the regnal insignia.

Of course, it can be argued that only a few imperial documents have been preserved from the Early Byzantine period. However, it is not very probable that new evidence might lead us to modify this statement, for a very simple but also very important reason: most probably none of the rulers concerned were expecting the emperor to address them with the exclusive regnal title. They themselves refrained from using this title in their own official presentations, that is, in documents, inscriptions, and coins. On the contrary, from what has been preserved of these we can say that the titles which the emperors used when addressing these rulers were the same ones which they ordinarily used for themselves. From the information we have we must come to the conclusion that, with the exception of the Sasanian *shahanshah* and the Ethiopian *nagusa*, who for some time usurped the titles of the Persian monarch, no ruler of this period ever officially used the title *basileus* for himself.

As an example of Oriental rulers it is worth mentioning that the rulers of the Nubians and the Blemyans in Africa, in the inscriptions commemorating their victories over their enemies, including the Romans, are called not kings (βασιλεῖς) but kinglets (βασιλίσκοι), the title we find in use in other sources for

¹⁸⁸ See *supra*, p. 41.

¹⁸⁹ See *supra*, p. 33.

rulers of this part of the world.¹⁹⁰ On the other hand, the Germanic rulers, the Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Franks, Vandals, Burgundians, and Lombards, who were constantly addressed by the Byzantine emperors as *reges* and never as βασιλεῖς, *imperatores*, or *Augusti*, consciously refrained from using these imperial titles for themselves. We have seen that the Ostrogothic King Theoderic the Great "did not attempt to arrogate either the garb or the name of emperor of the Romans but was called *rex* to the end of his life (for thus the barbarians consider proper to call their rulers)." ¹⁹¹

As for the Hun ruler Attila, whom Ostrogorsky included in his list as having been conceded the title βασιλεὺς by the Roman emperor, we have seen that even at the zenith of his power this title was consciously withheld from him and that he was unsatisfied with this situation.¹⁹² But he did not change it.

Thus, we can conclude that the Empire did not concede to the neighboring rulers the title βασιλεὺς and used other titles instead. Furthermore, this usage did not contradict but corresponded to the official attitude of the neighboring rulers, who consciously refrained from arrogating the exclusive title. This principle remained unchanged after the official assumption of the title βασιλεὺς by the Byzantine emperor at the beginning of the seventh century. The title was used by Western rulers only after Charlemagne's coronation in Rome on Christmas day in 800, which was regarded as the "coup d'état of St. Peter's basilica" until the title was officially conceded to him in 812; and in the East, the first to claim the right to assume the title was the Bulgarian Tsar Symeon in the early tenth century.

What are the implications of all these facts for the international relations of the Mediterranean world, and especially for the attitude of the Early Byzantine state? On the basis of modern scholarship one is inclined to regard the principle I have just described as an expression of the Byzantine idea that the emperor rules the whole world, that he pretends to be and is recognized as the *dominus totius mundi*, master of all the peoples of the world, and therefore the use of the imperial and regnal titles is an expression of Byzantine universalism, which is considered the absolute form of imperialism. However, if we study more closely the international relations of Byzantium, we might have reason to modify this opinion. In studying this question it is important to make a distinction between the nations that had been living in the East for centuries when the Romans arrived during their rapid expansion in the second and the first centuries B.C., and those nations that appeared at the northern and western frontiers of the Empire in the course of the third to the sixth centuries, invaded the Roman provinces, and eventually settled there.

I shall survey the Germanic nations first. These nations had kings who were elected by the free, national council to lead the people in their migration. Thus, the kings were *Volksführer*, leaders of the people, not lords of the country they had settled, and their royal authority did not include any territorial

¹⁹⁰ See *supra*, p. 44.

¹⁹¹ See *supra*, p. 57.

¹⁹² See *supra*, p. 58.

sovereignty. In this sense they remained *reges Gothorum, Francorum*, etc., never *reges Italiae, Franciae* (or *Galliarum*). When a peace treaty was concluded with them, the imperial government approved their settlement on the soil of Roman provinces; they became *foederati*, and the national kings were recognized officially as leaders of autonomous political units within the Empire, on the condition that they recognize the sovereignty of the emperor. This was expressed through the bestowal of imperial court titles, in the first stage military titles, such as *comes* or *magister militum*,¹⁹³ and, later, political titles, such as *exconsul* and *patricius*,¹⁹⁴ and in some cases through the *adoptio per arma*.¹⁹⁵

Of course, the fact that the Germanic nations “belonged” to the Empire (they were *reichsangehörig*) did not affect their political independence; the Byzantines were usually quite realistic in adapting themselves to this situation. On the other hand, there should be no doubt that the kings acknowledged the “constitutional” reality to which they belonged. We have already seen that Theoderic was cautious not to infringe upon the emperor’s titles and emblems. He was also cautious in more serious matters; for instance, he did not promulgate laws (*leges*), because this was the right of the imperial government.¹⁹⁶

Another Germanic ruler, the Burgundian king Sigismund, assured the emperor at the same time that *patria nostra vester orbis est*, and that the royal administration “does not reduce your sovereignty in your provinces.”¹⁹⁷ I think that whatever the practical reasons were for this strong expression of fidelity, Sigismund’s words reveal that he knew the institutional framework within which he was exercising his royal authority.¹⁹⁸ If we understand in this context

¹⁹³ These titles not only served to satisfy the barbarians’ vanity—we know notorious cases of national leaders who joked about their Roman titles—but also, more importantly, demonstrated to all sides that the kings were enrolled in imperial service. Furthermore, the annual subsidies, which the Empire very often had to pay to these leaders by virtue of the *foedus*, was in this way camouflaged as the ordinary salary for their service: Chrysos, τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ οἱ Γότθοι (note 40 *supra*), 156–64.

¹⁹⁴ On the new rank of *patricius* as established by Constantine, see W. Heil, *Der Konstantinische Patriziat*, Basler Studien zur Rechtswissenschaft, 78 (Basel, 1966), 54ff. For the *patricii* of the sixth century, see R. Guiland, “Les patrices byzantines du VI^e siècle. Contribution à l’histoire des institutions et à la prosopographie de l’empire byzantin,” *Palaeologia*, 7 (1959), 271–305. On the conferment of the Byzantine titles, see also Gasquet, *L’empire byzantin* (note 157 *supra*), 134–58, whose conclusions have often been neglected.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. P. E. Pieler, “L’aspect politique et juridique de l’adoption de Chosroès proposée par les Perses à Justin,” *RIDA*, 19 (1972), 428f.

¹⁹⁶ See A. H. M. Jones, “The Constitutional Position of Odoacer and Theoderic,” *JRS*, 52 (1962), 126–30.

¹⁹⁷ The letter of Sigismund was published and perhaps also composed by Avitus of Vienna, *Alcimi Ecdicii Aviti Viennensis episcopi opera quae supersunt*, ed. R. Peiper, MGH, AA, VI,2 (Berlin, 1883), 100: *Vester quidem est populus meus, et plus me servire vobis quam illi praeesse delectat. Traxit illud a proavis generis mei apud vos decessoresque vestros semper animo Romana devotio, ut illa nobis magis claritas putaretur, quam vestra per militiae titulos porrigeret celsitudo, cunctisque auctoribus meis semper magis habitum est, quod a principibus sumerent, quam quod a patribus attulissent. Cumque gentem nostram videamur regere, non aliud nos quam milites vestros credimus. Implet nos gaudiorum munere vestra prosperitas: quidquid illic pro salute omnium curatis, et nostrum est. Per nos administratis remotarum spatia regionum, patria nostra vester orbis est, tangit Galliam, Scythiam lumen Orientis et radius, qui illis partibus oriri creditur, hic refulget.*

¹⁹⁸ I believe that Schmidt fails to understand this framework when he describes the wording of the letter of Sigismund as “unwürdige Sprache”: *Die Ostgermanen*, 161.

Justinian's wars of the reoccupation of Africa and Italy, we must come to the conclusion that, although these wars were premature and politically shortsighted, they were fought on the basis of a constitutional commonplace, which we miss completely if we characterize Justinian's policy in the West as universalistic or even imperialistic.

I admit that it is very difficult to distinguish between the ideological claims to universal rule, which survive in many Byzantine literary sources, and what we regard as valid legal reality. On the other hand, it is very easy and even modern, but still wrong, to define the legal aspect as a fiction in absolute contradiction to the political reality, which alone should count. If the above-mentioned letter of Sigismund were not sent to the Byzantine Emperor Anastasius, but were instead the letter of a Burgundian lord sent three centuries later to a Carolingian emperor, we would have no difficulty in declaring it homage, typical of medieval feudal Europe. But how far are the two realities from each other? How far is the Early Byzantine type of *foedus*, applied to the legal arrangements for the settlement of newcomers to the Empire, from the *feudum* of medieval legal dependencies? These questions have not yet been seriously discussed, although much has been written explaining the origins of the feudal system and the etymology of the word *feudum*.¹⁹⁹ These questions are not asked because we are accustomed to regard the legal aspects of the settlement of the Germanic kingdoms as belonging to the realm of fiction. In medieval Europe the principle was voiced that the king was an emperor in his realm: *rex imperator in regno suo*.²⁰⁰ According to Walter Ullmann, "the meaning attached to it was that within his kingdom the king was sovereign, and this idea could be expressed suitably only in the language of the Roman law according to which the emperor was the supreme, 'superior' authority."²⁰¹ It seems to me that somewhere between the Roman law and its actual political expression in Early Byzantium we might find a further link between Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages regarding the constitutional development of the latter.

Let us now look at Early Byzantine policy in the East. In order to understand it properly we have to review briefly the policy of Rome toward the kingdoms of the East.²⁰² The republican senatorial government of Rome was reluctant to conquer the eastern kingdoms and transform them into Roman provinces. It was considered enough to control their foreign policy by making them Roman allies. During the so-called Roman revolution of the first century B.C., however, the powerful political leaders tried to impose their political will in Rome, carrying thence their glory and booty from victories against remote enemies and the transformation of these enemy states into Roman

¹⁹⁹ The current etymology of *feudum* is from Old German *fief*. However, the etymology from Latin *foedus* is not only possible but quite probable. Cf. V. Brömdal, "Moyen-latin feudum," *Donum natalicium Schrijnen* (Nijmegen, 1929), 447 ff.; I owe this reference to R. Schieffer, Munich.

²⁰⁰ See G. Post, *Studies in Medieval Legal Thought* (Princeton, 1964), 453–82.

²⁰¹ W. Ullmann, *A History of Political Thought: The Middle Ages* (Baltimore, 1965), 196.

²⁰² See Winter, *op. cit.* (note 37 *supra*), 35–50.

provinces. For the kingdoms which survived within the annexed territories, the political leaders usurped the Senate's right to appoint the client kings. It is significant that Caesar was the first to do so. Augustus decided to end the policy of perpetual aggrandizement and consolidated Roman authority in the East, accepting as the outermost limit of the Roman Empire the Parthian and Armenian borders. In the course of the first century A.D. the kingdoms still existing in the territory of the eastern Roman provinces were eventually abolished. Since these kingdoms were located in so-called imperial provinces, which were constantly increasing at the expense of the senatorial provinces, the royal authority of the absorbed kingdoms was assumed by the emperor, who legally exercised the king's rights in the former kingdoms through his procuratorial officials, and consequently was regarded by the subjects of the former kings as their new king, *basileus*. From the second century on, kingdoms dependent on Rome existed only beyond the official Roman frontier. The characteristic elements of the constitutional form of their kingship, which was similar to and influenced by the monarchical form of the Persian kingship, were first, the hereditary succession to the throne within the same royal family, and second, the feudal system of local nobility consisting of the landed proprietors who supported the king but at the same time limited his power. From the fourth century onward we notice a change in the Roman attitude toward the eastern client kingdoms. The first known cases are the Roman satrapies. When after the Roman-Persian peace treaty of 363 the northwestern part of Mesopotamia (the districts of Ingilena and Sophena) remained under Roman control, it was not incorporated into the provincial organization but continued to form an autonomous political unit under "princes," called satraps, not kings, who nonetheless were local nobles, invested by the emperors with the traditional emblems of their authority which they exercised as a kind of viceroy.²⁰³ After the division of Armenia into two parts, one Roman and one Persian, in 387 or perhaps 378, the southern part was transformed into four satrapies, Anzitenä, Asthianena, Sophanena, and Palabitenä, in addition to those I just mentioned. In the main part of Roman Armenia the kingship was abolished soon afterward. However, the country was not transformed into a province, but it was arranged that it be governed by an Armenian noble who was given the Roman title of *comes Armeniae*.²⁰⁴ We can observe the same policy toward all the other client kingdoms of the East. The kingdom of the Crimean Bosphorus suffered much destruction and numerous foreign occupations between the fourth and the sixth centuries. However, whenever this country emerges from obscurity during the sixth or the seventh centuries, we no longer find any kings ruling it, but we do hear of a *dux* exercising political authority.²⁰⁵

The kingdoms of Lazica and Iberia in the Caucasian area shared the same destiny. In the fourth quarter of the sixth century the kingship was abolished

²⁰³ Cf. *supra*, p. 46.

²⁰⁴ Cf. *supra*, pp. 38–39.

²⁰⁵ Cf. *supra*, p. 42.

there, too, and was replaced by the institution of the Presiding Prince of local origin, who exercised political authority while holding the Byzantine title of a *patricius* in the case of Lazica, and of *curopalates* in the case of Iberia.²⁰⁶ During his Persian war Justinian incorporated Great Armenia into the provincial system, abolishing the ducate.²⁰⁷ However, he did not do the same with the Gashanid Arabs. On the contrary, he united the phylarchies under one phylarch, the famous Al-Harit (Arethas), who was granted the title of a Byzantine *patricius*.²⁰⁸

Thus, it can be said that Byzantine policy toward the eastern client kingdoms from the fourth to the sixth century is a policy of gradual incorporation in one form or another. When direct annexation was necessary for military reasons and was politically opportune, the territory of the kingdom was incorporated into the provincial system. Otherwise, the administration was more effective and much less problematic when it remained in the hands of local nobles, who were appointed to carefully chosen ranks in the imperial service, and who exercised the emperor's authority as his viceroys.

The transformation of the client kingdoms into subordinate principalities no doubt inflicted the loss of their sovereignty. For their legal relations with the Empire were no longer based on *amicitia* or *societas*, the traditional Roman forms of clientele, which guaranteed the ally's territory and respected, at least in theory, his sovereignty.²⁰⁹ Now the emperor was accepted as the *κύριος*, the *dominus*, the lord—no longer the overlord—of the principality.

It is obvious that this concept of legal relations is not Roman. But if this is true, where did the concept come from? And how did it fit into the Roman constitutional tradition? Many aspects of this question are still to be elaborated, but the main line of development can be drawn.

It can be argued that if the emperor was considered sovereign over the above-mentioned principalities, it should follow that he was also sovereign over his own empire. But did Roman state sovereignty lie with the emperor? This is a perplexing question which has interested Roman lawyers since the second and third centuries A.D. It has been argued that even in the imperial centuries of the dominate and through the Byzantine period Roman sovereignty was with the *populus Romanus*, who delegated this sovereignty to the emperor and withdrew it if they thought he was not worthy of it.²¹⁰ Quite recently, H.-G. Beck, in his stimulating attempt to "de-ideologize" Byzantine constitu-

²⁰⁶ Cf. *supra*, p. 40.

²⁰⁷ Cf. *supra*, p. 39.

²⁰⁸ Cf. *supra*, pp. 46–51.

²⁰⁹ On these forms of Roman international relations, see esp. P. C. Sands, *The Client Princes of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1908), 88 ff.; B. Paradisi, "L'amitié internationale. Les phases critiques de son ancienne histoire," *Recueil des cours, Académie de droit international*, 78 (Paris, 1952), 329; W. Dahlheim, *Struktur und Entwicklung des römischen Völkerrechts im dritten und zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Munich, 1968), 163 ff.; M. Lemosse, *Le régime des relations internationales dans le Haut-Empire romain* (Paris, 1967), 20 ff.

²¹⁰ From the large bibliography on this matter, see S. Brassloff, "Fürstensouveränität und Volkssouveränität in den justinianischen Rechtsbüchern," *WSt*, 36 (1914), 351–54; G. Bagnani, "Divine Right and Roman Law," *Phoenix. The Journal of the Classical Association of Canada*, 3 (1949), 51–59; J. Karayannopoulos, "Der frühbyzantinische Kaiser," *BZ*, 49 (1956), 369–84 (repr. in *Das byzantinische Herrscherbild*, ed. H. Hunger [Darmstadt, 1975], 235 ff.).

tional history, correctly suggested that the Senate and the citizens of Constantinople were much more important constitutional factors than the ideological dressing of our evidence admits.²¹¹ However, it seems to me that we would abandon Byzantine legal reality if we tried to view the political power of the Senate and the populace of Constantinople as a constitutional factor in terms of being the source of the imperial authority.²¹² The key sentence as far as legal texts are concerned is that with which the Roman lawyer Ulpian explained the legislative authority of the emperor: "What the Emperor has determined has the force of a statute; seeing that, by the *lex regia* which was passed on the subject of his sovereignty, the people [populus] transfer to him and confer upon him the whole of their own sovereignty and power."²¹³

As a matter of fact, Ulpian's statement that the authority of the emperor is derived from the fact that the people have, by the *lex regia*, conferred upon him all their authority is strictly in harmony with the political theory of all previous lawyers. We also find the same theory in Justinian's Constitution, prefixed to the Digest, where Justinian himself is referring in explicit terms to the ancient law by which the Roman people transferred all their authority and power to the emperor.²¹⁴ However, it would be wrong, in my opinion, to interpret this juridical *topos* documenting the people's sovereignty as the source of imperial authority. This would be true only if the *lex regia* mentioned in Ulpian's sentence were to be understood as a constitutional act, part of the procedure of the emperor's proclamation and coronation, so that it would have to be repeated as the actual transfer of the people's authority to the emperor. But such an act is unknown to our sources.²¹⁵ Therefore, I am inclined to understand Ulpian's reference to the *lex regia* as a reminiscence of the decision of the Roman Senate to bestow upon Augustus his *auctoritas* over the *respublica* in 27 B.C.

²¹¹ *Senat und Volk von Konstantinopel. Probleme der byzantinischen Verfassungsgeschichte*, SBMün, Phil.-hist.Kl., 1966, no. 6 (Munich, 1966).

²¹² Beck, *op. cit.*, 71f., concludes: "Es ist es wohl nicht übertrieben, im Senat und im Volk von Konstantinopel Bestandteile und Triebkräfte des politischen Lebens zu sehen, die im Gesamt der byzantinischen Verfassung den Platz von *Verfassungsorganen* einnehmen, sofern man die Flüssigkeit des Begriffes 'Verfassungsorgan' innerhalb einer Konstitution, die als solche aus der irrationalen Sphäre des römischen Prinzipats stammt, nicht verschleierte." Cf. J. Karayannopoulos, in *Hellenica*, 23 (1970), 123–26. For a juridical correction, see P. E. Pieler, "Zum Problem der byzantinischen Verfassung," *JÖB*, 19 (1970), 55f.

²¹³ *Quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem: utpote cum lege regia, quae de imperio eius lata est, populus ei et in eum omne suum imperium et potestatem conferat*, cited in Justinian, *Digest* I.4,1, trans. Ch. H. Monro, *The Digest of Justinian*, I (Cambridge, 1904), 23. The authenticity of this passage is questioned by Bagnani, *op. cit.*, 55f. Cf. also U. von Lübtow, *Das römische Volk. Sein Staat und sein Recht* (Frankfurt, 1955), 466.

²¹⁴ See R. W. Carlyle and A. J. Carlyle, *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, 3rd ed., I (Edinburgh-London, 1950), 64–70.

²¹⁵ The *lex de imperio* as the Senate's legal act of conferring the *imperium*, known from the so-called *lex de imperio Vespasiani* (for the text, cf. S. Riccobono, *Fontes iuris Romani anteiusiniani*, I [Florence, 1941], 154–56), ceased to be promulgated before the end of the third century. According to von Lübtow, *op. cit.*, 407, "erst Carus hat bei seiner eigenen Erhebung und der seiner Söhne bewusst auf jede Mitwirkung des Senats verzichtet und dessen Recht ausgeschaltet. Bei diesem verfassungswidrigen Novum ist es in der Folgezeit geblieben, mochte sich auch ein 'recht klägliches Rest' der Bestallungsvollmacht in der durch die Kaiser erfolgenden Wahlanzeige mit anschliessender Akklamation des Senats erhalten."

I believe that this was also the way Justinian understood this alleged law when he referred to it in his above-mentioned Constitution: "Considering indeed that by an ancient enactment, the so-called *lex regia*, all legal authority and all power vested in the Roman people were transferred to the Imperial Government, and we do not attribute our collective legislative sway to this and that source, but desire that it should be all our own, how can antiquity interfere with our legislation?"²¹⁶ We see that Justinian was interested in showing that preexisting legal principles derived from former legislation should not have prohibiting power over his own legislation. Against this background the *lex regia* is considered the basic constitutional act with which in the remote past the Roman people transferred their sovereignty to the imperial government. Thus, it is no longer mentioned to explain how the emperors assumed the right of promulgating *constitutions* as the principal form of legislation, but in order to prove that the emperor's legislation is not necessarily bound to conform to the ancient laws.²¹⁷ However, if this is the meaning of the *lex regia* we are dealing with a constitutional form which in the essential question of sovereignty has moved away from the Roman tradition of the *maiestas populi Romani*. Furthermore, it is not difficult to recognize in this constitutional form the main characteristic of Hellenistic and/or Oriental kingship, which was the legal authority of the king over his subjects.

As a matter of fact, the people of Rome and of the East acknowledged this reality by calling the new constitutional form by its name. The Romans defined it ironically as *regnare sine regio insigni*, while in the East "the Greeks with their keen sense of reality, although they used the word *autokrator* for the new ruler as a formal title, soon preferred for everyday convenience to employ a term which indicated summarily what his position was, that is *basileus*."²¹⁸ This was also the way the Greek historians of Rome evaluated the establishment of the principate. Thus, according to Dio Cassius, in 27 B.C.

²¹⁶ *Codex Justinianus* I.17,1,7: *Cum enim lege antiqua, quae regia nuncupabatur, omne ius omnisque potestas populi Romani in imperatoriam translata sunt potestatem, nos vero sanctionem omnem non dividimus in alias et alias conditorum partes, sed totam nostram esse volumus, quid possit antiquitas nostris legibus abrogare?* Cf. *Monro, op. cit.*, xv.

²¹⁷ Analyzing a passage from the sixth-century *Treatise on Political Science* (ed. A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, II [Rome, 1827], 599) and a parallel passage from John Lydus (*De magistratibus* II.2, ed. R. Wünsch, Teubner [1903], 56 lines 24–26), F. Dvornik came to the following conclusion: "The first law of kingship, as defined by the Anonymous and supplemented by Lydus, represents the final stage in the growth of the Byzantine view on the origin of the Christian *basileia*. The Byzantines finally succeeded in reconciling two apparently contradictory principles: the divine origin of kingship and God's election of the candidate on the one hand, and the people's sovereignty freely conferred on their chosen leader on the other": *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*, DOS, IX (Washington, D.C., 1966), II, 716. However, both the anonymous author of the *Treatise* and John Lydus refer merely to the proclamation of the emperor and his assumption of the imperial insignia, and not to the people's delegation of their sovereignty to him. Cf. A. Pertusi, "I principi fondamentali della concezione del potere a Bisanzio. Per un commento al dialogo 'Sulla scienza politica' attribuito a Pietro Patrizio," *BISI*, 60 (1968), 13–15; H.-G. Beck, *Res publica Romana. Vom Staatsdenken der Byzantiner*, SBMün, Phil.-hist.Kl., 1970,2 (Munich, 1970), 18. F. Dvornik anticipated a millennium's political thinking which resulted in the modern distinction between state and society and the modern conception of the people's sovereignty. For the danger of interpreting medieval political ideas in the framework of modern political theory, see O. Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, 3rd. ed. (Brünn-Munich-Vienna, 1943).

²¹⁸ M. P. Charlesworth, "Pietas and Victoria: The Emperor and the Citizen," *JRS*, 33 (1943), 1.

"the power of both people and senate passed entirely into the hands of Augustus, and from this time there was, strictly speaking, a monarchy... the name of monarchy, to be sure, the Romans so detested that they called their emperors neither dictators nor kings nor anything of the sort; yet since the final authority for the government devolves upon them, they must be called kings."²¹⁹

Augustus refrained from assuming the royal titles but ruled the Roman Empire as a monarch for forty-one years, and people were stricken at his death. Only some years before, however, his uncle, Julius Caesar, who was actually ruling Rome as a monarch, tried to obtain the royal title; for this reason he was assassinated²²⁰ and his murderers were celebrated as tyrannicides.²²¹ We shall have to examine why the Romans were so reluctant to grant the royal title, hoping that this will bring us back to our main subject.

The first and principle reason would seem to be the traditional hatred of the Romans for the kingship, which was the first stage of their constitutional development, and which, according to tradition, had ended when the cruel tyrant *rex* Tarquinius Superbus was exiled. So, for the Romans, *rex* was synonymous with tyrant.²²² However, in the course of time the Romans learned from the Greeks that not every kingship is necessarily a tyranny. None less than Cicero, speaking of Tarquinius in his *Republic*, absorbed the Greek distinction and made the following statement: "Do you not see, therefore, how a king was transformed into a despot, and how a good form of government was changed into the worst possible form through the fault of one man? For here we have a master over the people, whom the Greeks call a tyrant; for they maintain that the title of king should be given only to a ruler who is as solicitous of the welfare of his people as is a father for his children, and maintains in the best possible conditions of life those over whom he is set."²²³ This distinction between kingship and tyranny was quite common during the imperial centuries and protected the Roman principate from being identified with tyranny.

It is interesting that the distinction appears again in a remarkable way in John Lydus. In his survey of the constitutional forms which Rome had under-

²¹⁹ Dio Cassius, *Roman History* LIII.17,1-2: Οὕτω μὲν δὴ τό τε τοῦ δήμου καὶ τὸ τῆς γερουσίας κράτος πᾶν ἐς τὸν Αὐγουστον μετέστη, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκριβῆς μοναρχία κατέστη... τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὄνομα αὐτὸ τὸ μοναρχικὸν οὕτω δὴ τι οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ἐμίσησαν ὥστε μήτε δικτάτορας μήτε βασιλέας μήτ' ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτότροπον τοὺς αὐτοκράτορας σφωὺν ὀνομάζειν· τοῦ δὲ δὴ τῆς πολιτείας τέλους ἐς αὐτοὺς ἀνακειμένου οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως οὐ βασιλεύονται. The translation is taken, with slight alterations, from E. Cary, VI (London, 1917), 235f. Cf. also Appian, *proem*. VI: Καὶ ἔστιν ἡδὴ ἡ ἀρχὴ μέχρι νῦν ὑφ' ἐνὶ ἀρχοντι, οὓς βασιλέας μὲν οὐ λέγουσιν, ὡς ἐγὼ νομίζω, τὸν ὄρκον αἰδούμενοι τὸν πάλαι, αὐτοκράτορας δὲ ὀνομάζουσιν, ὃ καὶ τῶν προσκαίρων στρατηγῶν ὄνομα ἦν· εἰσι δὲ ἔργῳ τὰ πάντα βασιλεῖς.

²²⁰ On Caesar's monarchy and attempted kingship, see D. Felber, "Caesars Streben nach der Königswürde," in F. Altheim and D. Felber, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Geschichte*, I (Frankfurt, 1961), 211-84; A. Alföldi, *Studien über Caesars Monarchie* (Lund, 1953); G. Dobesch, *Caesars Apotheose zu Lebzeiten und sein Ringen um den Königstitel. Untersuchungen über Caesars Alleinherrschaft* (Vienna, 1966); St. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford, 1971).

²²¹ On the idea of the tyrannicide, see R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), 1-46.

²²² See L. Wickert, "Princeps," in *RE*, 22 (1954), col. 2110.

²²³ *Republic* II.26 (47), trans. C. W. Keyes, Loeb (London, 1928), 157.

gone since the days of Romulus, he comes to the conclusion that the best form of government is the *basileia*, which is the opposite of regnal monarchy (τὸ ῥήγιον ὄνομα) and better than emperorship (τὸ Καισάρων ἡγουν αὐτοκρατόρων ἀξίωμα). Thus, he first defines the ῥήγιον ὄνομα as a tyrannical form of government and therefore repulsive to the Romans, and argues that it is wrong to attribute to the Roman *reges* of olden times the title βασιλεὺς;²²⁴ for the *reges* were tyrants and therefore by definition they could not be βασιλεῖς.²²⁵

Then John describes the “caesarian” form of state based on the definition of *imperare* and points out that this form is different from both the βασιλεία and the tyranny.²²⁶ Now, it is striking that between the principate and the βασιλεία John Lydus introduces another constitutional form, which he calls δομινατιῶν. According to John this form appeared when Diocletian transformed the principate into a tyrannical form of government by assuming royal insignia and introducing antipopular measures (heavy taxation, etc.).²²⁷ Finally, John Lydus describes the βασιλεία as the ideal constitutional form and argues that the βασιλεὺς preserves the state, properly administers the law in agreement with the best of the citizens, and takes care of his subjects like a father. In so doing the βασιλεὺς is the opposite of the τύραννος, who rules arbitrarily following only his vices without respect for the law.²²⁸

John Lydus’ definitions of βασιλεὺς and τύραννος are obviously taken from the old philosophical and rhetorical tradition, the Discourses on Kingship, the “mirrors of princes,” etc. Among many other authors, John definitely knew Synesius of Cyrene, who is the closest to him in time. Thus, he quoted verbatim from Synesius the remark that βασιλέως μὲν τρόπος ὁ νόμος, τυράννου δὲ νόμος ὁ τρόπος.²²⁹ However, John Lydus goes beyond Synesius when he dis-

²²⁴ *De magistratibus* I.3: “Ὄνομα δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν [i.e., Romulus et Remus] δ’ Ἰταλοὶ λέγουσι ῥήγιον οἶον τυραννικόν· οὐδὲ γὰρ βασιλείας Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἐννόμου ἐστὶ σημαντικόν, ὥς τινες ὑπολαμβάνουσι τὸ ῥήγιον ὄνομα· ὁ δὲν οὐκέτι μετὰ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τῶν ῥηγῶν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις καίτοι βασιλευμένους ἐχρημάτισεν. ἕτερον γὰρ τὸ τῆς ἐννόμου βασιλείας καὶ ἕτερον τὸ τυραννίδος καὶ ἄλλο τὸ τῆς αὐτοκρατορίας ἀξίωμα. . . . *Ibid.* I.5: . . . ὥστε τύραννος ἦν ὁ Ῥωμύλος.

²²⁵ This idea is clearly expressed in Diogenes’ answer to Alexander the Great’s question on how one could be the best king, as narrated by Dio Chrysostom, *The Fourth Discourse on Kingship* 24: “Ἄλλ’ οὐδὲ ἐστίν, ἔφη, βασιλεύειν κακῶς οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ κακῶς ἀγαθὸν εἶναι. ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς ἀνθρώπων ἀριστὸς ἐστίν, ἀνδρειότατος ὢν καὶ δικαιοτάτος καὶ φιλανθρωπότατος καὶ ἀνίκητος ὑπὸ παντὸς πόνου καὶ πάσης ἐπιθυμίας. . . . καθάπερ οὖν οὐκ ἐστὶ κυβερνᾶν μὴ κυβερνητικῶς, οὕτως οὐδὲ βασιλεύειν μὴ βασιλικῶς.

²²⁶ Τὸ γὰρ τῶν Καισάρων ἡγουν αὐτοκρατόρων ἐπώνυμον οὐδὲ βασιλείας ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τυραννίδος ἐστὶ σημαντικόν, αὐταρχίας δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ αὐθεντίας τοῦ διοικεῖν τοὺς ἐξανισταμένους κατὰ τῶν κοινῶν θορύβων ἐπὶ τὸ κάλλιον ἐπιτάττειν τε τῷ στρατεύματι, πῶς ἂν δέοι μάχεσθαι τοῖς ἐναντίοις. *imperare* γὰρ τὸ ἐπιτάττειν παρ’ Ἰταλοῖς λέγεται, ἐνθεν ἱνπεράτωρ. ὅτι δὲ βασιλείας οὐκ ἐστὶ σημαντικόν τὸ αὐτοκράτορος ἢ Καίσαρος ὄνομα, δῆλον ἀντικρὺς τῷ καὶ τοὺς ὑπάτους καὶ μετ’ ἐκείνους τοὺς Καίσαρας τὸ τῶν λεγομένων ἱνπερατόρων <ὄνομα> ἀξίωμα τῆς ἐπωνυμίας λαβεῖν. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπισήμοις τυραννικοῖς φαίνεται χρησαμένη ἡ τῶν Καισάρων ἀρχή, ἀλουργίδι δὲ μόνη τὴν Ῥωμαίων βουλὴν ἀναβαίνουσα καὶ τὰς ἐν ὅπλοις δυνάμεις αὐτοκρατῶς, ὥς ἔφην, ἰσύνουσα. ταύτη καὶ πρίγκιπας αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν Ῥωμαῖοι, οἷονεὶ πρῶτην κεφαλὴν τῆς πάσης πολιτείας: *De magistratibus* I.4.

²²⁷ Ἐφυλάχθη οὖν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἡ τοιαύτη τῶν Καισάρων εὐταξία ἄχρι Διοκλητιανοῦ, ὃς πρῶτος στέφανον ἐκ λίθου τιμίας συγκείμενον τῇ κεφαλῇ περιθεὶς ἐσθῆτά τε καὶ τοὺς πόδας ψηφώσας ἐπὶ τὸ βασιλικόν, ἢ τάληθὲς εἶπεν ἐπὶ τὸ τυραννικόν ἔτρεπεν, ἀνεμετρήσατό τε τὴν ἡπειρον καὶ τοῖς φόροις ἐβάρυνεν: *ibid.* I.4. καὶ δῆλον ἀντικρὺς, ὅτι Ῥωμαίοις ἔθους dominos τοὺς τυραννήσαντας ἀποκαλεῖν, ὥς δὴ Σύλλαν καὶ Μάριον, καὶ δομινατιῶνα τὴν τυραννίδα: *ibid.* I.6. As far as I can see, the term δομινατιῶν is in Greek ἀπαξ λεγόμενον.

²²⁸ *Ibid.* I.3.

²²⁹ *Ibid.* I.3; cf. Synesius, *On Kingship* VI D, ed. N. Terzaghi (Rome, 1944), 15 lines 7–8. Synesius must have been the source of John Lydus, for no other discourse on kingship contains this remark. The closest is Dio Chrysostom, *Discourse on Kingship* III.43–44.

cusses the titles which he considered proper for the emperors of his time. Synesius had praised the emperors of the fourth century for refraining from using the title βασιλεύς in their own official documents.²³⁰ In opposition to that, John Lydus speaks in favor of the title βασιλεύς instead of the titles δεσπότης²³¹ and *dominus*,²³² both of which are properly used only for the tyrants. Thus, we can see that John Lydus presents Justinian's regime as a sort of enlightened kingship. This form preserves the merits of the Principate, excluding its deterioration and degeneration, i.e., the dominate, which is rejected as a tyrannicide; on the other hand, it is purified from the faults of *regnum*, and is supposed to respect the law and take care of the people. A perceptive βασιλεύς preserves the tradition and the law and takes care of the state and the citizens, not as a *dominus* but as a father: this is the ideal kingship which is praised and defined by John Lydus under the experience and with the terminology of his time. This constitutional form can best be expressed by the βασιλέως ὄνομα.

We should expect that John Lydus' preference for *basileia* would lead him to propose that this should replace the traditional Roman "emperorship" (τὸ Καίσαρος ἄξιωμα). However, he is aware of a fact that prevents him from doing so. He sees the necessity of continuing to call his ideal constitutional form an emperorship, because with this title the emperors have been able to appoint kings (βασιλέας) to the other (client) nations.²³³

In his *Res gestae* Augustus praised himself, stating *inter alia* that in his triumphs nine kings or royal children preceded him.²³⁴ The way in which he mentions the many kings who in one way or another paid homage to him during his rule²³⁵ expresses in ideological terminology the superiority of the Roman emperor over the kings of the world. Thus, the emperor could not assume the title of a king because he was above all kings, and in many cases he was the actual king-maker, since it was in his power to recognize and invest the client kings.²³⁶ This idea appears again in John Lydus, not with ideological implications but as a real obstacle for the assumption of the title βασιλεύς by the emperor: the emperor cannot call himself officially a βασιλεύς as long as

²³⁰ Ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦνομα αὐτό σοι δείξω τοῦ βασιλέως ὄψιμον, ἐκλιπὲς Ῥωμαίοις γενόμενον ἄφ' οὗ Ταρκυνίου ὁ δῆμος ἐξήλασεν. ἀπὸ τούτου γὰρ ἡμεῖς μὲν ὑμᾶς ἀξιοῦμεν καὶ καλοῦμεν βασιλέας, καὶ γράφομεν οὕτως· ὑμεῖς δέ, εἴτε εἰδότες εἴτε μὴ, συνηθείᾳ δὲ συγχωροῦντες, τὸν ὄγκον τῆς προσηγορίας ἀναδυομένοις εἰκόκατε. οὐκ οὖν οὔτε πρὸς πόλιν οὔτε πρὸς ἰδιώτην οὔτε ὑπαρχὸν γράφοντες οὔτε πρὸς ἄρχοντα βάρβαρον ἐκαλλωπίσασθε ποτε τῷ βασιλέως ὀνόματι· ἀλλ' αὐτοκράτορες εἶναι ποιείσθε: *On Kingship* chap. 17, ed. Terzaghi, 38 line 16–39 line 6. Cf. Ch. Lacombrade's commentary, in *Le Discours sur la Royauté de Synésios de Cyrène à l'empereur Arcadius* (Paris, 1951), 142.

²³¹ Μισητὸν γὰρ καὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἐλευθερίας ἀλλότριον δεσπότης, ἀλλὰ μὴ βασιλέας, τοὺς κρατοῦντας ὀνομάζειν: *De magistratibus* I.6.

²³² *Ibid.* I.6.

²³³ Κρεῖττον δὲ βασιλείας τὸ Καίσαρος ἄξιωμα, ὅτι καὶ δοῦναι βασιλέας πάλαι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔπ' ἐξουσίας εἶχε: *ibid.* I.6.

²³⁴ *Res gestae divi Augusti* 4.3, ed. V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1955), 4–5: *In triumphis ducti sunt ante currum meum reges aut regum liberi novem.*

²³⁵ *Ibid.* 27, 31, 32, 33.

²³⁶ Cf., for instance, *ibid.* 27: *Armeniam maiorem interfecto rege eius Artaxe cum possem facere provinciam, malui maiorum nostrorum exemplo regnum id Tigrani regis Artavasdis filio, nepoti autem Tigranis regis, per Ti. Neronem tradere.*

other client rulers are appointed by him as βασιλεις. It was therefore only after the abolition of kingship in the client kingdoms neighboring Byzantium in the fourth quarter of the sixth century that the title βασιλεύς could be assumed officially by the emperors.

We have seen that the constitutional development from Augustus to Justinian was the gradual transformation of the Roman Principate to the Hellenistic *basileia*. On the other hand, the Early Byzantine policy of abolishing the kingship in the client states of the East had come to an end by the last years of the sixth century. Nevertheless, when this was accomplished still another factor, Roman relations with the other great power of the East, the Sasanian Great Kings, prevented the assumption of the title βασιλεύς. We do not have to analyze these relations *in extenso*. Nonetheless, it is necessary to remember first, that the King of Kings recognized the emperor's sovereignty over the Empire and its client states on the condition that the emperor recognized his sovereignty over the Persian Empire and its clients; and second, that this recognition of equal sovereignty was expressed through the official titles. The Sasanian monarch was recognized as King of Kings (βασιλεὺς βασιλέων), while the emperor was addressed as *quaisar i Rum* (Caesar of the Romans). It is obvious that these titles were exclusive. There was only one Caesar, the Roman, and on the other hand there could be only one King of Kings, the Sasanian. If the Byzantine emperor assumed the title *basileus* he would be indicating his submission to the *basileus basileon*, while the assumption of the whole exclusive title would mean an open claim to the Sasanian throne.²³⁷

This barrier was removed again at the end of the sixth century. When Emperor Maurice supported Chosroes II in regaining his throne in 591 a new Byzantine-Persian peace treaty was concluded, which restored Byzantine rule in northeastern Mesopotamia to the *status quo ante* A.D. 363. On this occasion Chosroes sent an official letter to his protector Maurice, in which he made for the first time in Roman-Persian relations a significant concession: he dropped from the inscription the exclusive title βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, and called himself Περσῶν βασιλεύς while at the same time he conceded the emperor the title βασιλεὺς Ῥωμαίων.²³⁸ This is the first known case of the use of this title in an official document of the international, highly sophisticated world of diplomacy in the sixth century. However, it was not only a gesture of diplomatic courtesy on the part of the young Persian prince. It was also a concession which enabled the Byzantine emperor to call himself what he already had been for centuries: βασιλεὺς τῶν Ῥωμαίων. On the other hand, the same concession strengthened the Roman-Persian peace on the basis of the balance of the two Great Powers, no doubt at the cost of the smaller and client nations. This is expressed at the beginning of the above-mentioned letter of Chosroes to Maurice: "The divinity has from the beginning ordered from heaven that two eyes should shine over

²³⁷ See *supra*, pp. 35-36.

²³⁸ Theophylactos Simocattes, *Historia* IV.11, ed. de Boor, 169.

the world, the most powerful emperorship [βασιλεία] of the Romans and the most perceptive scepters of the Persian state. Through these two greatest powers the disobedient and warlike nations are winnowed and the management of mankind is regulated and ruled forever."²³⁹

After the publication of A. Alföldi's classic articles on the imperial representation and ceremonies we have learned to be careful not to attribute to Persian influence the elements which characterize the Late Roman and Byzantine court.²⁴⁰ However true and helpful Alföldi's conclusions have been to the scholarship of the last forty years, there are several references in the sources which cannot be interpreted merely as anti-Persian topology, since there are some aspects of the constitutional theory and the political life of Early Byzantium which can be explained more easily as influences from the neighboring Great Power of the East than can be traced back to ancient Roman forms. This study of the Empire's attitude toward the client kingdoms should be considered one of these aspects. It has been stated above that the Roman system of appointing and investing kings is derived from the Persian (formerly Parthian) policy toward the client kingdoms within and without that vast state. It is the policy of the *shahanshahs* toward the local *shahs*. This influence is obvious in the Byzantine policy of appointing "satraps" for the Mesopotamian and Armenian districts which in the fourth century were under Roman control; does not the word "satrap" say everything? That the investment of Arab phylarchs with the insignia of the *maliks* of the desert was carried out in exactly the same way as the Persian king carried out the investment of the Lahmid phylarchs is another obvious example which marks the next chronological step in the assimilation process. Finally, the abolition of kingship and the replacement of the local kings by local princes in imperial service copied the Sasanian system of appointing *marzbāns* and other Persian dignitaries to administer the subordinate countries in the name of the King of Kings.²⁴¹

The official protocol of the peace negotiations which took place at the Persian monarch's palace in Ctesiphon in 561 offer a lively picture of how the two Great Powers were speaking the same language not only in their political and military aspirations and their ideological presentation, but also in their attitude toward the powerless countries whose future was entirely decided by them. The negotiations concerning the future of the small kingdom of Suania in the Caucasus illustrates this attitude. The Byzantine ambassador had put forth decisive arguments that the small country should be returned

²³⁹ Δύο τισὶν ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸν κόσμον καταλάμπειν πάντα ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὸ θεῖον ἐπραγματεύσατο, τοῦτ' ἔστι τῇ δυνατωτάτῃ τῶν Ῥωμαίων βασιλείᾳ καὶ τοῖς ἐμφρονεστάτοις σκήπτροις τῆς Περσῶν πολιτείας. ταύταις γὰρ ταῖς μεγίσταις ἀρχαῖς τὰ ἀπειθῆ καὶ φιλοπόλεμα ἔθνη λικμίζονται, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων διαγωγή κατακοσμεῖται καὶ κυβερνᾶται διὰ παντός: *ibid.* IV.11.

²⁴⁰ A. Alföldi, "Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniells am römischen Kaiserhofe," *RM*, 49 (1934), 1-118; and *idem*, "Insignien und Tracht des römischen Kaisers," *ibid.*, 50 (1935), 1-171; both repr. in *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Darmstadt, 1970).

²⁴¹ Christensen, *op. cit.* (note 126 *supra*), 97ff.

to Byzantine control, and he provided a list of Suanian kings who were invested by the emperors in the past. The King of Kings Chosroes, lacking counterarguments, suggested that the people of Suania be asked to choose their master, and he promised to accept their decision if they voted for their submission to Byzantium. The Byzantine ambassador, quite embarrassed by this proposal, wanted to know if the Great King was really thinking of asking the Suanians to decide their future. For he had no doubt that if conditions would allow they would choose self-determination. Thereupon, the Great King appeased the ambassador with a clear answer: Listen, he said, I am definitely not thinking of asking the Suanians anything concerning Suania, for it would not be pious or just to leave the country to the dangerous decision of its slaves!²⁴² The result was that Suania remained with the Persians.

E. Stein and G. Ostrogorsky explained the assumption of the title βασιλεύς in terms of the *Gräzisierung* of the Byzantine state in the seventh century. If we take the *Gräzisierung* as a historical process, including the Hellenistic legacy which survived in Byzantium but was also inherited by the Parthian monarchs, then we must expect the Sasanian empire to be much closer to and have greater impact on the neighboring empire in the West than the language and the religious barrier allows us to acknowledge. In these terms the assumption of the title βασιλεύς expressed the fact that the Roman emperorship had absorbed enough elements of the Hellenistic kingship to be given its name officially. Thus, beyond all other elements of "Hellenization," which became dominant in the seventh century, it was the Hellenistic idea of kingship, which had been experienced in the Sasanian empire, that prevailed in Byzantine *basileia*.²⁴³

APPENDIX

THE DATE OF INSCRIPTIONS LBW 2770 FROM KYTHREA, CYPRUS, AND GREGOIRE 107 FROM EPHESES

Inscription no. 2770 of the Collection of Le Bas and Waddington,²⁴⁴ which was supplied with two other fragments found and published by Mitford,²⁴⁵ contains the *intitulatio* of an imperial edict beginning with the title βασιλεύς. Unfortunately, the name of the emperor who promulgated the edict is erased in the inscription. Le Bas and Waddington as well as Mitford assigned the edict and the inscription to Justinian I. Quite recently J.-P. Sodini studied the imperial titles included in the existing fragments and proposed that the emperor's name was not Justinian but Tiberius II.²⁴⁶ He reads the first three lines in all three fragments as:

²⁴² Menander, frag. 11, *Excerpta de legationibus*, ed. de Boor, 186–88.

²⁴³ G. Röscher has written a dissertation on ONOMA ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΣ. *Studien zum offiziellen Gebrauch der Kaisertitel in spätantiker und frühbyzantinischer Zeit*, to be published as vol. X of *Byzantina Vindobonensia*. I wish to thank Otto Kresten, who allowed me to see the proofs of this remarkable book, although it was too late to make use of it for the present study.

²⁴⁴ P. Le Bas and W. Waddington, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1847).

²⁴⁵ T. B. Mitford, "Some New Inscriptions from Early Christian Cyprus, 7. A New Fragment of Justinian's Rescript from Kythrea," *Byzantion*, 20 (1950), 128–32.

²⁴⁶ J.-P. Sodini, "Une titulature faussement attribuée à Justinien I^{er}. Remarques sur une inscription trouvée à Kythréa, Chypre," *TM*, 5 (1974), 373–84.

† βασι[ι]λεὺς [Φλάβιος Τιβέριος Κωνσ-]
[ταντίνος] π[ιστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἡμερώ-]
τατος μέ[γιστ]ος εὐ[εργέτης καί].²⁴⁷

In my opinion there are some serious objections to this identification. Sodini finds an easy explanation for the erasure of the name of Emperor Tiberius. He suggests that the name was erased by some Cypriot who objected to the emperor's decision to transfer Armenian war prisoners to Cyprus in 578.²⁴⁸ However, this explanation is not very probable. First, Sodini seems to disregard the difference between war prisoners and refugees. For, as opposed to the refugees, the war prisoners in Cyprus would have been welcome as cheap labor.²⁴⁹ On the other hand, the year 578 as the date of the transfer is based on Hill's *History of Cyprus*: "towards the end of the reign of Justin II or more probably soon afterwards, the already very composite population of the island received an admixture of a large number of captives, who had been taken in Arzanene in Great Armenia by Maurice."²⁵⁰ However, there are two errors in Hill's statement. The transferred people were not peasants from Roman Great Armenia but war prisoners captured in Arzanene in Persarmenia. According to Theophylactos Simocattes, our main source for this war, φόνον τε πολλὸν τῇ Περσῶν πολιτείᾳ ἐνεπορεύσαντο· ζωγρήσαντες τε τοῦ Περσικοῦ ἐνένηκοντα πρὸς ταῖς δέκα χιλιάσις. . . .²⁵¹ On the other hand, this did not happen during the reign of Tiberius, but in the last year of Justin's reign before Tiberius was proclaimed emperor on October 6, 578. Again, Simocattes says that τούτων τὴν τρίτην ἀπόμοιραν Μαυρικίῳ τῷ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγῷ οἱ τοῦ ὀπλιτικοῦ δωρησάμενοι, οὐκ ἀνήκεστα τοῦ πολέμου τὰ ἐπίχειρα ἐπεποίητο. ὁ μὲν οὖν στρατηγὸς τῶν ζωγρηθέντων τὴν ἐνδημίαν παρεδήλου τῷ Καίσαρι, ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ ἀνὰ τὴν Κύπρον τὴν λείαν διέχεεν.²⁵² From this evidence we must conclude that Tiberius was still holding the title of Caesar when this event took place in the summer of 578, some months before he was proclaimed emperor.²⁵³ Thus, even if the Cypriots were not satisfied with the captives, the name they would erase would be Justin's and not Tiberius', since the latter was not yet emperor when this occurred in the summer of 578.

It seems to me that every attempt to date the inscription from Kythrea must start from the fact that the emperor for whom we are looking suffered the *damnatio memoriae*, regardless whether this happened officially as the Senate's decision or occasionally after his deposition and assassination.

The only emperor who is known to have been condemned officially in the period between Justinian and Heraclius is the tyrant Phocas. We know that when Heraclius came to Constantinople as a liberator Phocas was executed, and his statue in the Hippodrome was overturned and publicly burnt as a kind of symbolic *damnatio memoriae*.²⁵⁴

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 384.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 382.

²⁴⁹ According to Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History* V.19, ed. Bidez and Parmentier, 215 lines 19–22: τὰ σαγηνευθέντα αἰχμάλωτα δλοκλήρους νήσους καὶ πόλεις, ἀγροὺς τε ἐρημωθέντας τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξοικῆσαι τὴν τε γῆν ἐνεργὸν καταστήσασθαι πάντη πρῶην ἀγεώργητον οὖσαν. . . . Cf. P. Charanis, "The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire," *Byzantinoslavica*, 22 (1961), 198.

²⁵⁰ G. F. Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, 2nd ed., I (Cambridge, 1949), 281.

²⁵¹ Theophylactos Simocattes, *Historia* III.15,14–15, ed. de Boor, 143 lines 6–8. On the number 10,090, see Hill, *op. cit.*, 281 note 4.

²⁵² Theophylactos Simocattes, *Historia* III.15,15, ed. de Boor, 143 lines 8–12. According to John of Ephesos, the captives were Persarmenian Christians; *Ecclesiastical History* III.vi,15, trans. E. W. Brooks, CSCO, 106, *Scriptores Syri*, 55 (Louvain, 1936), 236; cf. also *ibid.* III.vi,34, trans. Brooks, 257.

²⁵³ It is in failing to see this clear indication that Hill dated this event after the death of Justin II: *op. cit.*, 281 note 3. His reference to Bury is irrelevant, since Bury does not date Maurice's expedition in Arzanene after Justin's death, although he is inclined to accept the year 578 rather than 577: *Later Roman Empire*, II, 104 note 1. Cf. Goubert, *op. cit.* (note 109 *supra*), 74–78.

²⁵⁴ See A. N. Stratos, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, I (Amsterdam, 1968), 90f. If the identification with Phocas is correct, perhaps we can come even closer to the date of the erasure of his name. Studying the coins struck in Cyprus in 609 and 610 with the legend ERACLIO CONSVLI, Philip Grierson has elucidated that Heraclius himself or his general Nicetas came to Cyprus in A.D. 609,

However, I cannot exclude another emperor whose name could also have also been erased on the inscription. This is Phocas' predecessor Maurice, who lost the imperial throne after a successful uprising against him. On Grégoire's inscription no. 111 the name of Maurice is erased,²⁵⁵ most probably in the course of the persecution suffered by Maurice, his reputation, and his family in the time of Phocas' regime.²⁵⁶

Sodini, who knows that the official assumption of the title βασιλεύς in imperial documents is not testified before Heraclius, explains the use of this title in the inscription of Kythrea so many years before A.D. 629 "par un contrôle, moins rigoureux en province, de l'exactitude des titulatures, surtout si l'on prend en considération que l'on désignait couramment l'empereur du titre de βασιλεύς."²⁵⁷ However, if the inscription contained the text of an imperial edict—and there is no doubt about that—I cannot see how the most "sacred" part of it, the *Intitulatio*, could be dealt with by "un contrôle moins rigoureux."

Sodini refers to another inscription, attributed by Grégoire to Justinian and dated to A.D. 535–36, in order to show that the use of the title βασιλεύς was possible in a provincial inscription before Heraclius.²⁵⁸ However, it is very doubtful that this inscription belongs to Justinian's time. Grégoire reads this inscription from Ephesos as follows:²⁵⁹

- [Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ δε]σπ[ότου] ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλεὺς]
 [Ἰουστινιανὸς] Ἀλαμανικοὺς Γοτθικοὺς Γερ-
 [μανικοὺς] Εὐανδαλικοὺς ἔνδοξος
 [νικητῆς τρ]οπεοῦχος ἀεισέβαστος Αὐγουστ(ος).
 5 [Ἐπειδὴ ταῖς ἐκκλ]ησίαις τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως τὴν
 [δέουσαν πρ]οσέκει τιμὴν προσάγεσθαι, κα[ί]
 [τῷ ἀγίῳ καὶ] σεβασμίῳ οἴκῳ τοῦ ἀποστόλου
 [Ἰωάννου τῷ ἐν Ἐφ]έσῳ διακειμένῳ κατὰ τὴν δύνα-
 [μιν ἡμ]ῶν προνοία τοῦτο μὲν τοῦ μακαριωτάτου
 10 [πατριάρχου Ἐπι]φ[ανίου] τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ περιβλέπτου
 [κόμητος τῆς Ἐφ]ῶ. . .

From Grégoire's note on line 10 it is clear that he had doubts about the essential evidence for the date 535–36.²⁶⁰ For we can restore Justinian's name in line 2 only if we read πατριάρχου Ἐπιφανίου in line 10 and identify the Epiphanius of the inscription with the patriarch of Constantinople of the same name.²⁶¹ Nevertheless, the alternative reading which Grégoire suggested for the five crucial letters ΔΑΡΟΥ in line 10 seems preferable to me. Therefore, in the first half

after taking Egypt on the liberation army's way from Carthage to Constantinople. The coins show that Heraclius no longer recognized Phocas, although he hesitated to let his army proclaim him emperor: P. Grierson, "The Consular Coinage of 'Heraclius' and the Revolt against Phocas of 608/610," *NC*, ser. 6, vol. 10 (1950), 71–93. Cf. *idem*, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, II, *Phocas to Theodosius III (602–717)* (Washington, D.C., 1968), 41, 208f. Cf. also W. Hahn, *Moneta Imperii Byzantini von Justinus II. bis Phocas (565–610) einschliesslich der Prägungen der Heraclius-Revolution* (Vienna, 1975), 86f. It seems quite probable that during Heraclius' or his general's stay in Cyprus the official inscriptions of the tyrant were destroyed and his name erased.

²⁵⁵ Grégoire, *op. cit.* (note 2 *supra*), 39. For a photograph of the fragment with the erased name, see R. Heberdey, "Vorläufiger Bericht über die Grabungen in Ephesus 1905/06, VIII," *ÖJh* (1907), suppl., col. 67. For the date of the inscription, see Ch. Diehl, "Note sur deux inscriptions byzantines d'Éphèse," *CRAI* (1908), 207ff.

²⁵⁶ Stratos, *op. cit.*, 52f.

²⁵⁷ "Une titulature" (note 246 *supra*), 377.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 377.

²⁵⁹ *Op. cit.*, no. 107, p. 35.

²⁶⁰ "L. 10. Restitution douteuse; les traces de lettres ΔΑΡΟΥ doivent sans doute s'interpréter ΦΑΝΙΟΥ à moins qu'il ne faille lire [προέ]πον": *ibid.*, 35.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 35.

of line 10 I would suggest the reading: [τῆς Ἐφεσίων προ]έδρου.²⁶² This suggestion takes into consideration the fact that after the ecclesiastical dignity mentioned in line 10 there does not follow the *praefectus praetorio Orientis*, who would be a *ἐνδοξότατος* (*gloriosissimus*), but only a lower dignity, perhaps the *comes Orientis* with the title *περίβλεπτος* (*spectabilis*).²⁶³ Furthermore, in the inscription from Ephesos the imperial title *Caesar* is omitted, which leads necessarily to a time when the title *βασιλεύς* had replaced all other imperial titles, including the title *Caesar*.

²⁶² The title *μακαριώτατος*, attributed in line 9 to the ecclesiastical of line 10, is found in numerous imperial documents to be attributed to Metropolitans. For the evidence, see E. Chrysos, *Die Bischofslisten des V. Ökumenischen Konzils (553)* (Bonn, 1966), 66 note 79.

²⁶³ On these titles, see P. Koch, *Die byzantinischen Beamtentitel von 400 bis 700* (Jena, 1903). Cf. also E. Hanton, "Lexique explicatif du Recueil des inscriptions grecques-chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure," *Byzantion*, 4 (1927), 116f., s.v. *περίβλεπτος*.